Revolution in Economic Life

W. RUSSELL SHULL

Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
ROBERT ELLIOTT SPEER

HC106
.3.S56

To Dr. Robert E. Speer
from the Author
With keen appreciation
for your fine leadership
W. R. Shull.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 2 1958
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Revolution *in* Economic Life

W. RUSSELL SHULL

The Elgin Press
Elgin, Illinois

Copyright, 1932, by
W. RUSSELL SHULL
Lewistown, Ill.

PREFACE

A very significant and searching report was adopted by the Central German Conference of the Methodist church, meeting in Columbus, Ohio, in September, 1931. This report is typical of the serious consideration many denominational and religious conferences all over America are giving to the present economic and business conditions. It is typical of the extensive and growing conviction on the part of many religious and social leaders of the great injustices and evils in the present order, and of their courage in speaking out on these economic and social questions which involve tremendous moral and religious issues.

This Methodist conference discusses the right of the church to deal with social and economic issues, and says, "When ninety per cent of the members of Congress are members of Christian churches, and the majority of our leading capitalists, industrialists, economists, and employers are professing Christians and frequently leaders in our Christian churches, when our church administrators solicit and accept millions of those dollars that were 'amassed without regard to social consequences,' and when the great institutions of the church invest their large endowments in these 'soul-less money-making systems,' can the church shift her responsibility to other shoulders; can she wash her hands in innocence? If she fails to face this problem as her problem and to confess the

sins of this profit-seeking and prosperity worshipping society, as her sins, and to put forth honest and earnest endeavors to remedy these unchristian ways and conditions, then she had better purchase a burial lot in the same cemetery, where the Russian Orthodox Church was laid away a few years ago."

Is it possible that the church has for people in the serious conditions of these days nothing more than the message of patience in suffering? If the church does not challenge the evils of our day and does not take steps to see to it that they no longer exist, the multitudes will challenge the right of the church to exist. They will fail to see the validity of her message. Shall we refrain longer from a discussion of the crucial moral and religious problems wrapped up in our economic conditions? Therefore this book.

The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Dr. Gerald D. Heuver and Dr. Fred S. Nichols, neighboring pastors, who read an early draft of these lectures and offered valuable criticisms and suggestions. Dr. Walter R. Cremeans, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian church in Springfield, Illinois, Rev. Jesse C. Shull, pastor of First Presbyterian church of Virginia, Illinois, and Dr. Alva W. Taylor, professor of Christian Ethics in Vanderbilt University, have rendered similar services. Encouragement for publication and valuable assistance in preparation for the same, have come from Mr. William G. Davidson, editor of a local newspaper, and Ex-Senator William S. Jewell, both

of whom carefully followed the lectures as delivered in public address. Special thanks go to Prof. J. Raymond Schutz, a beloved college professor and one who has been a great inspiration through the years, for his careful criticism of the manuscript and for the introduction to the book. The writer desires to express his great appreciation to the one who has been his constant and best helper in the development of this work. In the determination of both the form and content of these lectures, Mrs. Shull has been a genuine partner. We speak this message together.

There have been some sources of thought and inspiration that have been of major importance in the development of the message of these lectures. The challenging thought of Harry F. Ward, Halford E. Luccock, Sherwood Eddy, and many more, has been of greater value than can here be expressed. The courageous leadership of "The Christian Century" has been of invaluable assistance in working through the tangled web of the problems of modern life to some integrated thinking. To all sources of direct quotation and of thought, and to any whose permission to quote it may not have been possible to seek or to adequately recognize, the author offers grateful acknowledgment.

W. RUSSELL SHULL

Lewistown, Illinois.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Preface	3
	Introduction	9
I.	This Machine Age	13
II.	Our Religion of Prosperity	27
III.	The Pauper Problem	43
IV.	Has Our Economic Morality Worked?	57
V.	Justice Versus Charity	75
VI.	The Paradox of Our Depression	89
VII.	Is America Headed for Revolution?	105
VIII.	The Economic Challenge of Socialism and Communism	125
IX.	What Plan Will Win and When Will We Plan?	147
X.	The Simple Life in a Needy World	167
XI.	The Message of Jesus in a Tottering World	187

INTRODUCTION

Much religion is still based upon the individual conception, unconscious of a social order and of the social nature of human beings. This is the reason much religion has no meaning for society, and that so much preaching is futile and ineffective. Even Christianity, like other religions, is sometimes unconcerned about social and economic affairs. While it is called Christianity, it is not the message of Jesus, and should for that reason, perhaps, be called something other than Christianity. Jesus was interested in everybody and everything. Nothing that had to do with life was foreign to him and his message. Most of his teaching is an eternal rebuke to the asceticism that causes Christians to remain aloof from the world and its pressing social and economic problems.

The universal teaching of the social sciences in our schools has prepared society to think of religion in social terms. We are confronted now with the necessity of saving men as social beings in a social order. Any message that fails to recognize this social background and basis does not have a challenge vital enough to be preserved. On the other hand, the message that does, will not only be preserved, but will make possible the interpretation and solution of our most perplexing problems. The real Christian can no more remain aloof from economics and politics than he can live without bread and water.

The lectures of this book are current in interest and social in their treatment. The author is a keen student of social and economic affairs, with a passion for social justice. It was inevitable that the present crisis should call out of his active ministry a series of messages that should challenge thoughtful Christians. Christianity does have a vital message for our day, but not until we have inquired fearlessly into our economic morality. The preacher who remains silent in the face of things as they are can claim neither historic perspective nor prophetic vision. Let an Amos come to life again to protest against the evils and injustices of our age! Let all who love truth and justice cry out in the name of humanity! Let there be endless search and research into the great verities of our teeming, throbbing life! That is the work of this book. With fearlessness and candor the author points out what is wrong, and the remedy for it. It is stimulating and decisive in its grasp.

The author is a student and scholar whose judgment is carefully blended with spiritual insight. My knowledge of him as a college student of a decade ago caused me to anticipate the very thing he has done. He has done it so well that a large number of friends have urged the publication of the lectures that they might have a wider circulation. The lectures have sanity, poise, and spirituality. They are suggestive of the highest type of current preaching, and are provocative of the sanest kind of thinking in an age of confusion. It

is my sincere hope that this book may have an extensive circulation.

J. RAYMOND SCHUTZ

Professor of Sociology and Economics, Manchester College, Indiana;
President, Indiana Council of Religious Education;
Past Governor, Indiana Kiwanis.

CHAPTER I

THIS MACHINE AGE

On a summer afternoon about twenty-five years ago on the old farm in central Illinois, my brothers and I heard a strange rumbling down the road. We ran as fast as we could go across the big front lawn and climbed up on the front gatepost. I then had one of the big experiences of my boyhood days. For the first time in my life I saw an automobile. This buggy-like car sped down the road at fifteen miles per hour! It was only twenty years after that day that I drove my own car down Michigan Boulevard in Chicago. There were cars on either side of me. Four rows of them were going south with me and four rows were going north with somebody else. There were cars to the left of me and cars to the right of me, all driving leisurely at forty miles per hour.

On the same farm in Macoupin county, a little less than twenty-five years ago, when we boys were hitching our teams to cultivate corn we heard an unusual roaring in the sky. We looked and saw what appeared to be a giant bird speeding through the air. We climbed up our windmill and watched as long as we could see. It was another great experience of my boyhood days, for this was my first sight of an airplane. Less than twenty years after that time, thousands of the citizens of our state had the privilege of witnessing the wonderful

demonstration by the several hundred planes of the combined air forces of the army and navy of the nation.

In nearly as brief a time as the period of the development of my own experience in relation to the automobile and the airplane, this entire country, and every progressive land in the world, have been transformed from the days of handcraft and toilsome labor to the enlarged and liberating days of a machine age.

For the last half century and more the central attraction at every fair and exhibition has been Machinery Hall. The machine has occupied the most space in all exhibitions portraying the world's progress; and perhaps it should, for it now occupies the largest place in the life of our society. It is probably proving to be a more potent factor than any other in the determination of the character of modern man.

The machine is remaking our civilization. We are inhabiting an entirely different world from the one in which our fathers lived. This is a new world, for the old things have passed away. All things have become new—and multiplied—and accelerated. We live at ten times the speed of our fathers. We do ten times the work of the last century. We have one hundred times the things of yesterday because of the machine. The life of the world has been vastly altered. It is speeded up. It is far more efficient. It is vastly more complicated. It is easier and more difficult because

of the machine. The machine is at the center of our civilization.

This Machine Age is one of tremendous benefits and of tragic problems. Sometimes it seems that the problems almost outweigh the benefits.

The machine is turning many men into machines. Instead of the skill, personal interest, and pride of craftsmanship of earlier days we have a man pushing and pulling a lever—pushing and pulling—pushing and pulling. A few years ago I worked in a factory in Indiana. All I had to do for ten hours a day was to place two irons under a riveting machine with both hands, then push a lever with one foot, and stand on the other. This was all I had to do—the same thing one time after another, over and over again. I felt like a pigmy—or a dummy. Probably I was. I would have been if I had stayed there. No creative effort was called for. No interest was possible. I would have dwarfed my brain and starved my soul had I continued such work for years. The mind and soul of the modern factory workman are bound for lack of interest, creative purpose, and heroic endeavor in his own enterprise. This might be largely offset if the workman had stakes in the profits of his own labor, but he does not.

The machine has destroyed the personal touch in industry. It has created the factory; and the factory to be profitable must operate on a large scale. Large scale production means thousands of

workmen in one plant, and as a result the personal touch is gone.

The machine has created the unemployment problem. One can now do the work of one hundred. In the railroad shops in Galesburg, Illinois, there has recently been installed a new system by which six men can do the work of three hundred. In one industry after another the increased efficiency by machinery means that fewer workmen are needed. And so, as a result of the machine, we have one of the greatest social and moral problems of our modern society—our tremendous problem of unemployment. I will say here that I see no complete or permanent solution under our present individualistic system. It is evident that there are some big bills to be charged up to the machine.

But the solution is not the destruction of the machine. Some would say: Pile them all up and smash them into smithereens; blow all machinery into bits and thus cancel these problems. Dr. Spengler says the time will come when man will "blot the machine from his memory and his environment, and create about himself a wholly new world, in which nothing of this devil's technique is left."* It can not be done.

We can, if we like, fight the progress of modern invention and applied science in the billion and one phases of modern life, but we are only butting our heads against Gibraltar. The mind of man goes

* From "Men and Machines," by Stuart Chase. By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

marching on. It is the genius of man to do his best at subduing the universe. And the best that the mind of man can find will always be applied in the best that hand can do. The perfecting of our industrial processes is inevitable. We could never do away with the machine. We do not care to.

The solution is not destruction but control. The ills of our present order can not be ascribed to the machine itself. Anyone who has studied history knows that inhuman exploitation did not arise with this modern machine age. Go with me to visit the ancients, back to the days of feudalism, back to the days of the Roman galley ships, back to the days of the construction of the pyramids of Egypt, back to the days of the building of the walls and palaces of ancient Babylon, and witness the soulless exploitation of millions of workmen. You will recall Lew Wallace's picture of Ben Hur and his fellow slaves.

It is estimated that half of the industrial accidents of today are the result of speed for the sake of profits. Any slavery experienced by the modern workman in tending the machine is not the necessity of the machine; such slavery exists only because our present system is being operated to the advantage of some and to the disadvantage of others. In his book "Money and Machines" Stuart Chase says, "Man is not the slave of his machines, but he has allowed them to run unbri-

dled, and his next task is, by one method or another, to break them to his service."*

The driver is the dangerous part of every machine. I am not afraid of automobiles; but I am very much afraid of some drivers. Likewise, with our industrial machinery, I am not afraid of the machines; but I am very much afraid of some operators. Let greed be seated at the wheel and there will be an abundance of economic and moral tragedies. Exploitation and inhumanity in industry are the result of profit-seeking and not the result of the machine. It is up to the driver. The system that operates the machine—the motive back of its use—determines whether the machine is an asset or a liability in the life of the world.

It can be a great asset. It is. It is estimated that there are three billion mechanical slaves in America—thirty servants for every man, woman, and child. The service of the machine can not be measured. It is lifting heavy burdens from the shoulders of men. It is adding to the comforts and dignity of life.

We want the machine for what it does. It creates for us a million things. We have access to the greatest assortment of material goods mankind has ever seen. We have the finest apparatus and equipment to assist us in everything we desire to do. We have things to supply every need, things to satisfy every want, and a million more.

The trouble is, the million more may be spoiling

* By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

us. Statisticians have figured that a hundred years ago the average person had seventy-two wants and that sixteen of these were necessities. They estimate that today we have four hundred eighty-four wants and ninety-four of these are considered necessities. "The world is so full of a number of things" that I am not sure we shall "all be as happy as kings." The number of things may crowd us out—crowd out the best in us. This is what is happening to many people.

We all want things; and we get some things. Then we want more things; and we get more things. We get our house full of things. Then we must build a bigger house to hold our things. So we buy some things to build a bigger house to hold our things. And then we must get some more things to fill our big house with things. And these things make us want more things. Things! Things! Things! We surround ourselves with more things than we can ever use.

The whole world is organized to compel us to buy more things than we need. Travel down our highways and half of the beautiful views are marred by billboards. Some of the homely barns are made more homely with red and yellow senseless signs. Step into the street car, and we are bombarded with advertisements of things. Walk down the streets of our cities and every window cries out for our attention. Return to our own home and the daily papers waiting at our door are one-half advertising; and we can never be quite sure how much of the half that isn't is. We turn

on the radio to drown all our cares in the music of some grand opera, and suddenly there breaks through the sweet strains of that restful music, the sound of a burly, commercial voice, "the best overalls on the market for one dollar and twenty-nine cents per pair." We turn off the radio in disgust, and withdraw into our private study to be alone with our thoughts, and some salesman raps at our door.

We open the door; and we bite. Most of us have been oversold by high-pressure salesmanship. Look on the parlor table, and in the medicine cabinet, and on the buffet, and in the pantry, and out in the tool shed, and all over that new car, and in the dresser, and in every room in the house—and don't forget the attic—and see the things you do not really need. Many of us have furniture we do not need. This makes me think of what I heard some lecturer tell (was it Ralph Parlette?) about dad getting up in the night in the dark to try to orient a crying baby, and how he bumped his heels on three different rocking chairs—chairs they did not need—things in the way of happy living.

The problem of every twentieth century customer—and that is what we are—is to know the proper use of the two words, "know" and "no"—to know when to say no, and to have courage enough to not even go to the door—the door of over temptation to lose our lives in things. Just yesterday I had to turn down a persistent salesman because I believed this writing was more important

than his wares. I do not know what I rejected when I said no, but I do know what I kept.

In his splendid book, "Jesus and the American Mind," Halford E. Luccock tells about an accident in New York City in a building occupied by a five and ten cent store. The store caved in and a perfect avalanche of everything rained down on the people below. This is about what has happened to many people today. As Luccock says, "Things have caved in on them. They are lost in the things of the world."* Jesus said, "All these things do the Gentiles seek." Gentiles? No! All these things do most Christians seek.

What do most people think about? Of the thousand thoughts of the average man on the average day, how many go deeper than the things of his own material environment? What is the vocabulary of his daydreams? Is it more than football, cars, radios, clubs, and stock market? What would we hear if we put a loud speaker on the brain of the average woman? Would it be more than overstuffed furniture, steaks, gowns, and bridge? Ralph Parlette, in his famous lecture, "The University of Hard Knocks," makes this statement: "The world says that to get greatness means to get great things, so the world is busy getting—getting great fortunes, great lands, great titles, great applause." He also says, "All outside life is a failure. Real life consists in being things on the inside, not in getting things on the outside."

* Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

Here lies one of the big issues of our civilization and of every civilization. Many can find happiness only in things. Many are making things the center and circumference of life. Luccock writes in his chapter on "Externalism," "Porcelain bathtubs are so much easier to obtain than peace of mind; the thrill of speed is so much more obvious than the 'splendor of a sudden thought'; the peace of economic security, which all can understand, is so much more tangible than the peace of God which passeth understanding, that we readily lose life in absorption with its machineries."* In his book, "Jesus or Christianity," Kirby Page says, "A materialistic society soon becomes jaded and constantly seeks new thrills. The history of mankind seems to make it clear that luxurious communities tend to overemphasize sex and to indulge in all manner of excesses. Herein is found a partial explanation of the reason why there are so many divorces and other domestic tragedies. Happy homes can not be built upon the pursuit of things and thrills." I heard of a family that bought a twelve dollar clock and paid for it at fifty cents per week, while father, mother, and seven children gathered around a bare table to eat boiled beans and cheap meat from a common bowl. As Emerson said, "Things are in the saddle"; they are riding many a man and woman into physical exhaustion; and mentally and spiritually there is

* From "Jesus and the American Mind." Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

"nobody home." They do not have time to be at home with their own minds.

But, as the solution of the problems created by the machine is not the destruction of the machine; so with things, the product of the machine, the solution is not the destruction of things.

We believe in no asceticism. We should ride things—ride them as far as they will go. And the large portion of the people need more to ride. We should get all that things have to give. This is the only purpose for which they exist. They are here to be our servants. But note that word—servants, not masters! A man once said, "I owned fifty thousand dollars and I was happy. Now five hundred thousand dollars owns me. It says, 'Run here,' and I run. It says, 'Trust in me,' and I trust in riches. I am rich, unhappy and hanker for more." "But," he was asked, "why then don't you give the four hundred fifty thousand away and return to your happy state?" "Ah," said the man, "did you ever hold the handle of a galvanic battery? The more juice, the tighter you hold on."

One of the greatest needs in order to restore economic stability in the world, and especially in America, is for all people to think more about internal possessions and less about external possessions. Many must give more thought to what they are, and less to what they have. This must be if we would permanently solve our economic problems.

Jesus said, "A man's life consisteth not in the

abundance of the things which he possesseth." We declare it does, and proceed to get all we can; and the result is competition, struggle, and war for the things of the world. However, only those who possess spiritual wealth can afford to disregard material wealth.

We have taken the things that belong on the circumference of life and have put them in the center; and we have taken the things that belong in the center of life and have put them on the circumference. In this rush age, there is little room in the margins of our time and energy for the more spiritual values. In the lives of modern men these are unattained luxuries. What is the value of all the machinery in the universe if our lives are lost in the product? "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?" What is the value of goods if they do not build the good life?

Our big problem is to learn the difference between living and the accessories of living; to learn the difference between the means of culture and culture; to see that things are for use in living and not the end of living. History shows that the aids to life easily become substitutes for it. A manufacturer installed an elaborate and ingenious filing system. A month later the salesman came around and asked, "How is the new filing system working?" "Good! Better than we had hoped," was the answer. "That's fine!" eagerly replied the salesman. "And how is business going?" "Oh,"

said the business man, " we have had to give up business in order to look after the filing system."

The tragedy of the possession of things is that so many give up living in order to take care of those things.

CHAPTER II

OUR RELIGION OF PROSPERITY

What determines a man's religion? Does creed? Do ceremonies and ways of worship? Does church membership? Does the place or frequency of church attendance? William James defined religion as "The assumptions on which a man habitually acts." The clue to a man's real religion is the ideas and ideals that control the bulk of his thinking—the desires and objectives that determine most of his actions—the purpose and longings by which he lives.

Does not prosperity come very near being the religion of many Americans? Is not mammon the master of our actions? Is not money the emperor of our deeds? Do not profits determine the major decisions of our society? What is first with most men? What is the deep and abiding urge that permeates their minds? What speaks first when men approach decision? What is the first voice—the primary urge of the soul?

This is the religion that matters to me. I care little about a man's creed, or church, or the title of his religion, compared to this set of the soul—this urge of the total personality.

I am not questioning the validity of prosperity. I am not saying that self-preservation should not be one of the major concerns of every man. Nature

made us so; and by this instinct of self-preservation man survives the centuries. By the agencies of modern science this instinct is wonderfully aided, and survival is reasonably certain. I do not say a man has a religion of prosperity because he labors for self-preservation and for the welfare and comfort of his loved ones. But I do say a man has a religion of prosperity if he seeks profits in business before the welfare and comfort of the loved ones of other men. Bishop Francis J. McConnell says, "The call for a spirit of service does not mean that every man is to neglect his own business for that of his neighbor's. It means that the profit motive is not to be the determining motive. It means that the basal necessities of all are to be attended to before there are special privileges for any."*

If a man is determined to win prosperity—if the abiding urge of his life is financial success without regard to the moral and spiritual welfare of all men—he has a religion of prosperity. To find the answer to our question we must look at the major objectives of men in their industrial policies.

I am afraid we will have to admit that, in the final analysis, profits dictate most major industrial decisions.

Profits come before increase in wages. Just when wages were getting somewhere near what they should have been, industry began to move South. A table giving the average wage per year in all industries, shows that the average wage in

* From "Is God Limited?" By permission of the Abingdon Press.

Georgia was $702, and that other southern states were similar. In Massachusetts, Ohio, and Pennsylvania the average was about $1,300. $700 versus $1,300! Therefore, industry goes South. What will be the result of such a course? It can be nothing else than unemployment and lower wages for the North, with many of the modern economic and social problems enlarged instead of solved; and, though bringing immediate benefits to the South, the same industrial problems the North has had are certain to arise there. The same industrial and social battles will be fought again.

Why all this? Do we have a religion of prosperity? I am not attacking individual industrialists. I am not here pretending to pass on the economics of this policy. I am only asking, whether profits are not before wages. And therefore, are not profits before the welfare of the working class?

We talk about our high standard of living. Yes, we have prosperity. But our prosperity does not extend to such basic industries as coal, textiles, and agriculture. Regardless of all our talk about prosperity it is still a fact that two-thirds of our families are living below a wholesome standard of living.

Robert S. and Helen Lynd have written a book entitled "Middletown." They veiled the name of the city in order that the facts might be more frankly faced. Middletown has a population of about thirty-eight thousand, consisting mostly of native whites. It appears to be a prosperous city.

Material advantages and comforts seem plentiful. Two-thirds of the families have cars. Middletown has her theatres, her Rotary, and other civic clubs, including a Chamber of Commerce and a Business and Professional Women's Club. Her citizens have adopted the customary slogan, "Middletown is the best place on earth." In driving through the principal streets of the city one is impressed with her prosperity. But when going down the side streets and into the back sections of the city, it is found that a majority of the inhabitants are poorly housed and lack the means of culture and wholesome living. Though many of the families have more than one wage earner the income of seventy-seven per cent of all the families is below two thousand dollars per year; and many are continually haunted by the fear of unemployment.

Is not this typical of the conditions in all our cities, in the midst of our talk about prosperity? "Middletown" was written when we did have it. We? Yes, those who did the talking! It appears that this religion of prosperity is not a religion for the masses. Herbert Hoover, when Secretary of Commerce, said, "There is to my mind, no economic failure so terrible in its import as that of a country possessing a surplus of every necessity of life with numbers willing and anxious to work, deprived of those necessities. It simply can not be if our moral and economic system is to survive." "It cannot be"? But it is! Why? Because we have a religion of prosperity in which profits come before the welfare of the worker.

And, profits come before the welfare of all the people. Stuart Chase says, "The new science of business management, given a free hand, might remake American industry humanely as well as technically. Given a free hand it might abolish poverty, immeasurably diminish the stresses and strains which have dogged every step of the industrial revolution since the days of Watt. It might flood the nation with essential and even beautiful goods at a fraction of their present cost, raise the curse of Adam, and lay the basis for, if not positively usher in, one of the noblest civilizations which the world has ever seen. But the hands of management are not free."* Business policies are not now determined for the welfare of all the people.

A few years ago a western city kept suppressed the facts about an epidemic of infantile paralysis, to the great risk of the health of the people, because broadcasting the facts would hurt the tourist trade. Prosperity first, human need second! Produce companies, a summer or two ago, dumped truck loads of vegetables into the river in New York, in order to maintain the balance of prices, while many families were in great need of those wholesome foods. Prosperity first, human need second! Radium mines in Africa have been sealed, controllers bringing out a little at a time, so as to keep the market from breaking, regardless of how much suffering might be relieved by more radium.

* From "Jesus and the American Mind," by Halford E. Luccock. Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

Prosperity first, human need second! The great promise of human betterment through the marvelous development of modern science, has been robbed of its fulfillment by the dictates of greed. As has many another religion before, this religion of prosperity is swindling the people.

Hunger fighters and disease fighters win in their fight, only to have greed step in and keep wheat from the mouths of millions and medicine from those who cannot pay. Luccock writes, "We have been repeatedly told by engineers that there is enough technical knowledge and skill now at command which could lift the burdens which have crushed mankind, abolish poverty, more than double the standard of living, and deliver men from many of the scourges which have crippled and blighted life. Surely here are enough skill and resources. Why is it not done? The answer is simple. There is more immediate profit to be made for some interests in the present waste and inefficiency. These results are sacrificed to the idol of economic gain. Such results would require planning arranged with general social welfare in view, and that is not the primary aim. The immediate aim of business must be, first of all, to make money."*

Profits come before the present and future welfare of society. Certainly the welfare of society is not being considered in the management of our farm situation. There were sixteen farm fore-

* From "Jesus and the American Mind," by Halford E. Luccock. Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

closures for our Fulton County fall term of court. Many of these farmers worked hard for years for their farms. They probably worked harder than some in other professions who have laid up thousands of dollars. Many a farmer is losing the farm he loves—losing his home. He is losing the farm he wants more than anybody else—losing the farm he needs more than anybody else—losing the farm he could probably farm better than anybody else. Why? Because somebody else has some money invested in it; and because that money must earn a certain per cent. Not that the farmer's money must earn a certain per cent, not that! Certainly our social engineers, our experts in management, are having little part in this problem.

I am not necessarily criticizing the one holding the mortgage. I am trying to say that we are caught in one great system where profits rule—where profits determine every decision. Profits are first, the welfare of the people is second! It is not a question as to whether the farmer and his family should live on the farm they love. It is not a question as to whether his family needs its home. It is not a question as to whether tenantry is good for our country. According to the estimates of Kenyon L. Butterfield, the amount of mortgage debt on our owner-operated farms increased, between 1910 and 1925, from $1,725,000,000 to $4,517,000,000. The total debt of American farmers today is probably between eleven and twelve billion dollars. From 1924 to 1925 it took thirty per cent of the cash income of farmers, operating their

own farms, to pay interest on debts. America in a very brief period is being turned into a land of tenantry. Why? Because tenantry is best for the future of society? European history has answered. Because it is best for our present society? Who would dare to say it is? Why? Because money must have its reward. And, as we said, not that the farmer's money, plus labor, must have its reward; but because the money of someone else, without labor, must have its reward. Our religion of prosperity says, profits must go to him who can get them. Are some demanding their pound of flesh?

A manufacturer in England has said that in the first half of the last century manufacturers could make one hundred per cent profit and that as much as three hundred per cent was possible. But it is by such profiteering that the masses of the English people have been so pauperized that all present programs of rehabilitation are not able to restore them to economic and moral independence. Yet American industries go South, because of low wages and no unions.

Profits come before our most sacred institutions and sentiments. Everything is commercialized. Christmas is captured by the salesman. Easter is a financial burden instead of a spiritual blessing. The enjoyment of our national Independence Day is dependent on the money we have to spend. Our leisure time is turned into a source of profits. What a campaign to make us spend money! Some firms favor a short day and week so the working

people will have more time to spend money; and—don't let the workmen hear it—they will reap the profits. I wonder if the same firms are consistent enough to pay their workmen more so they will have more to spend. This is the biggest handicap of immediate progress; the masses have nothing to spend. Education is subsidized for profits. The infamous example here is the effort of the Light and Power Companies to determine the content of textbooks, in order that future citizens and legislators will be in favor of private ownership of natural resources. Such are the tactics of this religion of prosperity: Profits by any means—profits for those who can get them. Even public service is commercialized. What a paradox! What blasphemy of the way Jesus spelled the word service! Politics has become a big chance to fleece the public. Its corruption is the extension of the religion of prosperity into its policies. This kind of religion had better stay out of politics.

Every religion has some fanatics. The religion of prosperity has many. There is an increasing craze for profits. Just when a large number of Christian people are beginning to see the fundamentally unethical character of gain without work, comes an increased wave of passion to get something for nothing. George Bernard Shaw defined a gentleman as "one who tries to put back a little more than he takes out." Does not this seem like the Christian thing to do? Yet nothing could be farther from the attitude of millions, which is, to put in as little and take out as much as possible.

From 1914 to 1928 the number of millionaires in the United States increased from 7,000 to over 30,000. Mr. Carl Snyder, of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, says that this was largely due to the enormous rise in the value of securities since the war, and to the colossal manipulation of those securities. "Colossal manipulation," not colossal production! One author calls this the greatest gamble the world has ever seen.

Stock Exchange seats in New York increased in price as much as 600 per cent in seven years. In 1895 there were sixty-seven branches of the New York Stock Exchange outside of New York City; today there are over 1,000. This increase in speculation was carried on through millions of borrowed money, not through savings. This has put a heavy strain on the credit system of the country. Thus, loose money is captured for speculation and is not available for needed productive enterprises. One of the major and fundamental troubles with business today is the craze for easy money. There are too many fanatics. Men seem easily to become fanatical once they accept this religion. This trouble with business is so serious and fundamental that it threatens to wreck the entire machine. It rattles under the strain. It wabbles. It rattles and wabbles because no system can give easy profits to all. And it is now a question as to how long any system can give easy profits to a few, and stand the racket.

This spirit of easy profits is capturing the masses. Many are becoming fanatics. We can not

wonder at this when we see the broadcast of propaganda. Scan the stock market news of the metropolitan papers and witness the preaching of the gospel of gambling. Even game manufacturers have cashed in on the speculative craze by selling tickers. Read this ad.: "Ticker—the new Wall Street game that is sweeping America. Puts zip into every party. On the table is Wall Street complete—quotation board, ticket, stock certificates, margin calls, bear raids, extra dividends—the actual features of the Stock Exchange. You buy and sell stocks. They skyrocket or tumble. You are cleaned out or make your pile. Every session a riot. Teach it to the children."*

And the children are learning it. Ask most any boy his greatest wish, and will it not be for a million dollars?

And the young men are learning it. Do you know what our young men are choosing for their vocations? There is a pronounced tendency toward finance instead of the professions, salesmanship instead of pursuits of production, distribution rather than creation.

But there is an economic law, an old law, and a fundamental law, which is the very heart of all economics. The world can not live by distribution. Man can not survive on speculation. Is not this one of our fundamental difficulties—too many wanting the light jobs of distribution—too many seeking the lazy jobs of speculation—and too few

* From "Jesus and the American Mind," by Halford E. Luccock. Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

working to produce? This is not all. The distributors and speculators have contrived to get the large share of the profits. We have, therefore, the fundamentally sick economy in which few profits are left for the basic tasks of production. Those that are most foundational are now not self-supporting. Our major profits are going to the superfluous profession of speculation, and our next highest rewards go to the secondary job of distribution, while the primary workers of the world, the producers—those who feed and clothe and warm humanity—must go into bankruptcy. Such an insane economy must end in the brambles. If we think our craze for easy profits can go unchecked, we have never studied the primer of economic law. G. K. Chesterton, in "The Forum," writes: "In all normal civilizations the trader existed and must exist. But in all normal civilizations the trader was the exception; certainly he was never the rule; and most certainly he was never the ruler. The predominance which he has gained in the modern world is the cause of all disasters of the modern world."

The fanatics of a religion are always its greatest enemies. The fanatics of this religion of prosperity may possible destroy their own god.

Let us ask our question again. On the basis of these pronounced characteristics of our economic life, do we have a religion of prosperity? Do we have a money culture? Are we worshipping prosperity when the person with the highest salary receives our greatest esteem, when the business

with the biggest dividends is considered the most successful, when the man leaving the largest estate to his family is the supremely successful individual, when the chief question at every funeral is, what was he worth? The tax list is our honor list. Some time ago a widely published advertisement told the story of two boys who started in life together. One was a success; he sat behind a mahogany desk and pushed a buzzer. The other lived on a side street in a simple home with his family. It was implied that the latter was, therefore, a failure. Do we bow at the feet of prosperity? Is our god the god of profits? Have we a pagan gospel?

I am wondering if we do not need that old lesson of the Shorter Catechism. It taught the children that the chief end of man is "to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." Our children are instructed that the most important business of life is to get property and pass it on to one's descendants.

Do we have a religion of prosperity? Jesus said, "All these things do the Gentiles seek." Moffatt's translation of their text is, "Pagans make all that their aim in life." Are there pagan Christians? How pagan is our Christian civilization when the man who makes all these things his aim, and gets them, regardless of how much others get, is our greatest hero?

America has a religion of prosperity. This religion has a god and that god is profits. It has a creed, and the fundamentals of that creed are: First, the chief end of man is to get all he can and

hold it for his own enjoyment. Second, the best means of doing this is by any means. Third, men who do this are responsible for our prosperity, and therefore deserve the bulk of all profits. Fourth, greed for personal gain is the only motive sufficient to make a business suceed, which is to say, selfishness serves best. Fifth, capital being the creator of our prosperity, property rights must precede human rights in order that capital may continue to give material comforts, at least to some. Sixth, because of these tenets of faith, the government, and especially the religion of Christianity, must never interfere with members of this religion in their determined effort to practice their religion, that is, to get all they can. Seventh, whoever does interfere with members of this religion, or in any measure questions the articles of this creed, whether in the name of human welfare, or in the name of the religion of Jesus, is a dangerous radical, to be carefully watched, and if advisable, cast into prison, in order that this sacred religion of prosperity may be maintained, especially among its own adherents. This is not a missionary religion.

We can not here discuss the truth of this creed. We should ask two questions: First, are not the scientists, engineers, technicians, administrators, and other experts, the real geniuses of our material civilization? Have we not seen that these could serve the world far more efficiently were it not for the creed of the religion of prosperity? Second, does the doctrine that greed for personal gain is the only sufficient motive and driving power for

great endeavor tally with the history of most great achievements? Does the doctrine that selfishness serves best—most devotedly, heroically, and efficiently—tally with the history of the lives of our great inventors, discoverers, scientists, educators, missionaries, and many more of the greatest heroes of every civilization? I leave it with you as to the truth of this creed.

Melvin A. Traylor, former president of the American Banking Association, in an address at a meeting of the World's Chamber of Commerce said, "Ambition, stupidity, and greed, have dictated policies, and trouble has been the result." Probably, as George Bernard Shaw says, "The demands of Jesus are turning out to be good sense and sound economics."

It is time for us to begin to challenge this religion of prosperity in the name of the religion of Jesus. Luccock says, "The profit motive can not go unchallenged if Christianity is to be anything more than a pious decoration on a pagan pattern of life."* If the Christianity of Christians is no more than a few sentiments about Jesus, tacked on to the religion of prosperity, then the religion of Jesus is already defeated.

The greatest enemy of the Christian creed is not atheism, or any heresy, but the pagan creed which says that the chief end of man is to get the mastery over the resources of the earth and control them for himself and his own.

---

* From "Jesus and the American Mind," by Halford E. Luccock. Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

I am not worried about Mohammedanism or Buddhism or Confucianism or any other ism or major religion as a rival of Christianity for the heart of the world. But I am worried about the rivalry of our Christian-paganism with the Christianity of Jesus. The supreme struggle of the centuries is the religion of prosperity versus the religion of Jesus. I believe I know which will ultimately win in the life of the world. I am not certain which will win in our present American civilization.

CHAPTER III

THE PAUPER PROBLEM

All poor are not paupers; and all paupers are not poor. Pauperism is not synonymous with poverty.

A few words should be said about poverty. It is time the Christian church and society recognize poverty as tragedy. Some actually argue for it. Bernard Mandeville declared: "To make society happy, it is necessary that great numbers should be wretched as well as poor." I wonder whom he means by society. Some quote Jesus, "The poor ye have with you always," and argue that poverty is in the plan of God. But the fact that it is with us, is no sign it is God's will. Such reasoning is the result of a degenerated social passion.

A person is poor who lacks the necessities for comfortable living, the equipment for efficient living, and the facilities for abundant living. The lack of these is tragic. Certainly, it is tragic to lack the necessities for comfortable living. Visit China, India, Korea, Africa, South America, and many of the countries of Europe, and many homes in America, and see the tragedy of poverty. Multitudes do not have enough bread for health. The masses of our world are not comfortable. The masses of our world are poor.

They would not need to be poor. This is the

tragedy of the situation. Stuart Chase said, as we quoted him in the last chapter: "Given a free hand, the new science of management might remake American industry humanely as well as technically. Given a free hand it might abolish poverty, immeasurably diminish the stresses and strains which have dogged every step of the industrial revolution since the days of Watt. It might flood the nation with essential and even beautiful goods at a fraction of their present cost, raise the curse of Adam, and lay the basis for, if not positively usher in, one of the noblest civilizations which the world has ever seen. But the hands of management are not free." One of the greatest tragedies is that of wasted human resources as a result of lack of equipment for efficient living. It is tragic for the individual, and for the race. Nevertheless, the vast majority lack this equipment.

I fear President Hoover is not correct in speaking of this as a land of equal opportunity. In his King's Mountain speech, he insisted that the unique feature of our American society is equal opportunity for all. Does he not overlook some of the major facts? This is not a land of equal opportunity. The strong may have an equal chance at the big prizes, but what determines the outcome of the chance? And, what makes it chance? And still more fundamental, why is the strong man strong? Do all have an equal opportunity to be strong? John Bennett comments on Mr. Hoover's view, thus: "He overlooks the fact that ability, initiative, and energy depend upon a

degree of physical and mental health; and that slums and mining villages are not as favorable for these conditions as suburbs and farms. Too often children are stunted and dulled by poverty in the early formative years. They do not have equal opportunity to develop the very qualities which make for success in the American race for wealth and power."* Our land of equal opportunity is largely myth. Mr. Hoover fails to consider that the children of the successful have a leading start. It is easier for them to get training. It is easier for them to get the position desired when they are ready for work. It helps to be a member of a club or fraternity with the children of the successful. Sons and personal friends of employers are often promoted over other employees who have greater ability and more experience.

Some one suggests that our society produced an Edison. But I think there might be a thousand Edisons. I can now name three young men each of whom is the making of a genius in science and invention. But they have no opportunity, no money for education, no chance. Each of them is more than willing to work. They have great ambition. They are among the flower of the younger generation. But they are three of the tragedies of poverty. Oh, the tragedy of wasted human resources! We can never know the losses of society. And they are losses that need not be. If we would remove the poverty which the world

* From "The Christian Century."

knows enough to remove, and has resources to remove, these tragedies would not be.

We will not take time to note the unrealized possibilities because of the lack of facilities for abundant living. The tragedy of poverty is greater than we know.

As we have said, all poor are not paupers. Pauperism is not a matter of poverty. A person is poor who lacks the goods for efficient and happy living. He may be making a noble effort to have these goods, but can not get them. A pauper is one who makes little or no effort to get them. He is one who receives his living, wholly or in part, from persons who are not his natural supporters. He is willing to have it so. He is not productive. He has no sense of responsibility for his own provisions or for the welfare of society. He has lost his spirit of initiative and independence. It is this spirit that is the essence of pauperism. He may be able-bodied and able-minded but his spirit is that of a parasite.

Pauperism presents some of the most serious problems of our society. It creates some of our most knotty difficulties. Here comes a tramp to my door. In ordinary days, nine times out of ten, he is a loafer—a parasite on society—willing to live off the labor of the other fellow. Sometimes he is determined to live off the other fellow. He will not work. He is too lazy to feed himself. Shall we feed him? I recognize the teachings of Jesus that have a bearing on this question. And yet I doubt whether we should feed him. I have always be-

lieved that we encourage him to continue in his pauperism by feeding him. It has been my abiding conviction that such a man, for his own sake, should not be fed.

I have heard it said that today many are lying around waiting on a hand-out—waiting on a dole. For the laborers who are doing this I have little sympathy. Many of the poor could be in far better circumstances now, if throughout the past they had been diligent in labor and discreet in spending. Laziness, thriftlessness, and carelessness have been the great causes of poverty. Character is the first essential for the economic redemption of individuals and nations. Men who are not willing to buckle down should not have the rewards of effort and struggle. Goods are demoralizing to him who will not labor to produce them. A supreme and eternal need for the realization of economic welfare is the genuine willingness on the part of all men to carry their share of the world's tasks of production. All idlers ought to be compelled by society to face the alternative of work or starvation.

But it is very evident that today we can not declare that most unemployed are sitting around waiting for a hand-out. Our present problems of dispensing charity are far different from those in normal periods. Certainly, many now in great need are most willing to work. Many of the poor today face the impossible. I know some of them in our own town—noble souls, with high ideals, with a willingness to work and a determination to win—but they seem to battle against fate. Our

system has created the impossible, and compels fathers of large families to face it. There is a mocking limit to our exhortations that the poor should exercise industry and thrift. Our society now has on her hands a gigantic wreck; and she may have to haul some of the victims to the hospital.

However, I have no faith in a dole system, on a private scale or on a national scale. Both are demoralizing. I am ready to agree with the Illinois Manufacturers' Association in its opposition to the dole. I am not sure that unemployment insurance is necessarily a dole system; but, whether or no, unemployment insurance, and most pension systems, are only relief from bad conditions which should and could be prevented. The Illinois Manufacturers' Association is right in saying that unemployment insurance will not prevent unemployment. It is relief, not prevention. They say that the dole in England "has ruined the public morale by establishing a vast array of non-workers who make no attempts to secure work and regard the dole as their inalienable right. The ideal that dangles before the youth of Great Britain is not work but compensated idleness." We do not want such results. Anything that will pauperize the people is dangerous. I believe it is the duty of every man to work to provide the necessities of life for himself and his loved ones. I have little sympathy with the pauper spirit, except as our social order and environment have been responsible for creating that spirit. Probably the respon-

sibility of society is greater than we know. Many paupers may deserve the keenest sympathy. However, the remedy is not charity or a dole system.

I am opposed to any system of doles; nevertheless, we should note the weak spot in the logic of some who are fighting every form of national relief. Mr. Strawn, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has sought to warn the United States of the dangers of the dole. In his speech over a nation-wide hook up, he spent most of his time decrying the dole. He said, "To set up a dole system, private or governmental would be a great calamity." With this we may agree. But read these words from Mr. Strawn: "I am in entire accord with the plan of the President in the selection of a general overseeing committee to encourage local communities to take care of their own unemployed during the coming winter. I regard it as the duty of every employer of labor, and of every one else who can by reasonable sacrifice do so, to contribute liberally to the unemployed funds now being collected throughout the country. These contributions are not charitable gifts. They are premiums on insurance against socialism and the stability of our government."* He warns to beware of a dole, private or governmental, and at the same time says, give liberally to unemployment funds. Beware of a dole; but give to relief funds! What do words mean? Certainly, our bread-lines and soup kitchens and the activities of many or-

* Quoted from "The Christian Century."

ganizations, and local relief projects, which Mr. Strawn favors, are the purest kind of dole systems. It is interesting to note, according to the report of the Russell Sage Foundation, that last winter, local funds provided over seventy per cent of all unemployment relief.

Evidently it is a certain kind of dole that many are opposing. An editorial from "The Christian Century" on this point, says: "The dole begins, according to the thinking of big business, when the funds come from the federal treasury, or when unemployment insurance is forced on the employer by the state. It is not hard to understand why big business is attempting to establish this definition. If relief is to come from the federal treasury, there is a practical certainty of an increase in income taxes. And the demand will be for placing the burden of this new taxation on the upper brackets, no question about that. Local taxation, however, is seldom on income. Neither is it, in most cases, on plant investment. It is on the small home owner and, indirectly but none the less actually, on the rent payer. Hence, a system which requires seventy per cent of its funds from local taxation is 'American,' while a system that requires federal taxation of those best able to stand it is a 'dole.'" Is big business forced to contribute liberally to charity so the millions of unemployed will remain in compelled submission? Is this the only insurance against socialism that capital can find?

Big business seems to be against a dole system that would compel large incomes to carry the big

load, and for a dole system that would compel those with small incomes and small amounts of property to carry the load. I am convinced that neither offers anything in the nature of a permanent solution of our problems. I am afraid of pauperism. But remember the wreck. Many measures which should never be needed may be necessary now.

As we have said, pauperism is unwillingness to work. He who is willing to live by the effort and labor of others is a burden and liability to society. But note—one willing to live by the effort of others. Then maybe we have paupers at both ends of the social scale. We said at the beginning, all poor are not paupers, and all paupers are not poor. Some of the greatest paupers have abundance of money. They may have all the necessities for comfortable living, the equipment for efficient living, and the facilities for abundant living, but are, nevertheless, paupers if they are willing to live by the labor of others. The person who gets something for nothing, or much for little, has the pauper spirit. Many wealthy families are being borne on the backs of the poor, who are not their natural supporters.

"The Christian Century" in a recent issue, printed the following: "In May, 1927, there died in the city of New York a gentleman named Harry Payne Whitney. Mr. Whitney's father had been a lawyer and politician in the second half of the last century. He was a man of more than ordinary intelligence and vigor; he achieved the eminence

of a seat in one of Cleveland's cabinets; he became a heavy owner of public utilities, particularly of street car lines, in New York. He thus became wealthy. At his death he left a fortune which, divided among his numerous heirs, has provided the basis for several other fortunes, some of them largely in excess of the original Whitney accumulation. Some of these fortunes have been used intelligently and in public service, as in the case of the present Mrs. Leonard Elmhurst. Mr. Payne Whitney is spoken of by the conservative 'New York Times' as a 'capitalist and sportsman.' What that means is that he received his share of his father's fortune, put it out at interest, and spent his days in playing and promoting the playing of polo, maintaining a string of race horses, paying the upkeep of sundry yachts, and in general loafing along through life in about as irresponsible, vapid and socially useless a manner as can be contrived. The street railways that his father had built up went bankrupt, but society rewarded Mr. Payne Whitney for allowing the use of his money as capital by giving him an estate which, when he died, was appraised at $186,579,746. It takes a little time to wind up estates of that sort. According to the final accounting just made public by the surrogate's court of the county of New York it took until May, 1929, to complete the job in this instance. And when the job was completed, the estate totaled $239,301,017. In other words, the estate of this man by the simple process of lying dormant for two years increased $52,721,271. If

anyone believes that this sort of thing is going to continue to be possible indefinitely in this land where millions face starvation and half the population live always on the border line of a bare sustenance wage, he is a fool."

Is a dole at the summit of society as dangerous as one at the bottom? The number of millionaires in the United States increased from 7,000 to 35,000 in fourteen years. This was due largely to manipulation in securities. In other words, it was due to scheming to get a dole from the total resources of society.

What is the extent of pauperism in our land? The property of a number of corporations is now worth more millions than the thousands put in by their investors. We agree that pauperism at the bottom of society is not good for the pauper or for society. Can we agree that pauperism at the top of society is not good for either the pauper or society? Pauperism at both extremes of the social order is demoralizing.

Is not the history of third and fourth generations of capitalists sufficient evidence of this demoralization? It has been said that wealth seldom remains in one family for more than three generations. The early landlords used and developed their land. Their descendants degenerated while living on the rents from the inherited estates. The early industrialists were energetic in the development of their industries. They themselves, rather than the employed technicians, engineers, and managers, were probably responsible for the suc-

cess of their enterprises. But today, many of the descendants of these master industrialists are turning the tasks of operation and promotion to salaried specialists, while they, relieved of responsibility, live in leisure off the dividends. It is the privilege of such demoralizing independence that develops the pauperism of the rich. Independence of one's own effort ends in dependence. In proportion to the number involved, the loss of human resources at the top of society, because of the degenerating power of luxury, because of the privilege of living off the labor of others, is, I believe, as great as the loss at the bottom because of poverty.

Let us see definitely this condition of our society. Many at the top are pauperized because they have too much. Many at the bottom are handicapped because they have too little. Both groups are stunted and undeveloped; and society is the loser. Yes, and they are losers. All are losers! Too much and too little—this is the chief tragedy of our social order.

Why can not this condition be balanced?

Mrs. Shull and I drove for two hours down the boulevards of one of the finest suburbs of Chicago. We saw their luxurious homes, with their private beaches, their lovely lawns, their cars at the door for any service that whim might suggest, with everything the heart might desire. The next day we drove through the Ghetto and slum sections of Chicago, and caught a renewed glimpse of the terrible handicaps of poverty. Why not some bal-

ance between these extremes? Why should both groups be ruined by their condition? Does America need the war time challenge of the British labor party, that none are entitled to cake until all have bread? Too much and too little—this is the great tragedy of our society!

These two groups include the larger portion of our population—those on the one hand who live largely by the labor of others, and live so luxuriously that they are handicapped and cursed because of ease, and the dependence of independence, and on the other hand, those who do not have sufficient goods to live comfortably, efficiently, and abundantly.

My question is, for the sake of all those definitely involved, and for the sake of society, why not cancel the curse of both extremes?

CHAPTER IV

HAS OUR ECONOMIC MORALITY WORKED?

What is our economic morality? What is our standard of conduct for our industrial and business life? Sometimes it seems we come very near having none. It appears that every man does "What is right in his own eyes." Yet we do have one.

What are the outstanding characteristics of our economic order? What is its major motive—its chief ideal—its ultimate goal? What are its major methods—its ways of reaching its goal? What attitude and conduct are representative of the major drive of our industrial and business system?

I believe that we will have to recognize that its major motive is profit—its chief ideal is financial success—its ultimate goal is wealth, luxury, and power. Certainly we must grant that we have a religion of prosperity. And, while there are noble exceptions, the large majority of men in business and industry will use most any means and methods to reach that goal, just so they are within the compulsions of our laws, which are continually lagging behind the ingenuity of a passionate greed.

We close our eyes to the fundamental and evident characteristics of our economic order, in our blind hope that it is somewhat Christian, if we can not see that we have very largely a money culture,

a civilization built around the dollar. And this means that the passion of the people is, get rich, get all you can, get while the getting is good! Make your pile, and pass it on to your descendants!

We should note that this is the passion of most of the people. We would probably speak more accurately if we talked about our acquisitive system rather than our capitalistic system, because this central drive of our economic order, this major motive, this chief ideal, is characteristic of the majority of the people. The poor as well as the rich, the employee as well as the employer, and labor as well as capital have accepted the profit motive. All are seeking to acquire. We have an acquisitive system. If we call it a capitalistic system we name it after the successful in the race.

We should be careful that we do not despise the capitalist who has succeeded in the race, when we desire to enter the same race, and follow the same rules, in a scramble to reach the same goal. If we question anything about our economic order we must go deeper than to condemn capitalism; we must get at the ideal that would create capital. We must analyze the profit motive. We need to study the results of our economic morality. We need carefully to observe the way our ethics of business are working—see the results of the profit motive—see what this central drive of business actually produces. The central drive of any program or institution is the essence of its morality. Therefore, when we ask the question, Has our economic morality worked? we are seeking to determine

whether or not the profit motive works when it becomes the chief objective of business and industry.

What have been the results of our economic morality?

It is true that our economic morality has resulted in great wealth. We probably control one-half of the entire wealth of the world. We have many millionaires. We have the highest standard of living of any civilization that ever existed. We have wealth, prosperity, high wages, material comforts, education, and culture. It is quite possible to go into ecstasy about the achievements of our civilization.

But before the state of ecstasy approaches trance we had better look carefully at some more facts. Dr. Harry F. Ward, in his book, "Our Economic Morality," says: "The people who are visible and vocal seem most of them to be comfortable and contented. Everywhere the streets and the trains are full of well-dressed, well-fed folk. Most of those we know have or can have cars, radios, and membership in clubs or secret orders. But in the back streets of those mill towns where the women have to work nights to keep the family going, in those mining towns where the men have not had a full week's work for years, in those industries where wages are being cut, in those farm sections where tenancy increases or mortgage delinquencies and bank failures multiply, there is another story about how things are working."*

* By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

We must listen to these other stories. They are a part of the result of our economic morality—of our acquisitive system. They are a large part. And, I am beginning to wonder if they are not an integral part. I am wondering if big success on the part of a few in the race for profits, does not necessarily result in failure on the part of many in that race.

While attending the 1931 National Gladiolus Exhibition in Cleveland, I read in one of the Cleveland Dailies: "Federal Council Points to Breadlines and Great Wealth"—"The Federal Council of Churches today indicted society for allowing an economic system which makes possible the stark contrast of vast fortunes and breadlines. . . . The Council's message points out the contrast between dividends paid by key corporations in 1930, amounting to $318,600,000 more than in 1929, and the fact that factory payrolls showed a twenty per cent reduction the same year. 'During the last year we have seen millions of men and women tramping the streets looking for jobs, seeking help in churches and police stations, standing in breadlines and waiting in the vestibules of relief societies. This army of unemployed has been composed chiefly of the manual and clerical workers upon whose competent labor we have all depended for the necessities of life.'" What is called prosperity in America is enjoyed by about one-fourth of the population who own nearly all the property.

I repeat, I wonder if "Millionaires and Breadlines" are not an essential result of our competi-

tive system. When a race is on someone is going to lose. Is not this the inevitable result of our morality?

So, when going into ecstasy about the wealth which our system has created, we should take a look at the necessarily existing other side of the picture. Our acquisitive, competitive system must inevitably result in a land of extremes. It resulted so in England. An official report in England has recently spoken of the devitalization of large sections of their people by unearned incomes on the one side and underpaid labor on the other. Study almost any advanced industrial nation, past or present, and see if extremes are not the result.

Therefore we say, with wealth as a result of our acquisitive system goes something else. And that something else is just as certain as the wealth. If the testimony of the history of many nations means anything, then an acquisitive competitive system results in something else besides wealth for the large majority of the people. On an individualistic competitive basis wealth somehow gets centralized.

Our economic morality has given rank inequality of incomes. We grant that the condition of the laboring man in America is better than of any other group of laborers, at any place or at any time in the history of the world. But general statements such as this mean little until the whole story is written. We said that one-tenth of our population owns ninety-five per cent of the property. But, in a recent year, one-third of one per cent paid ninety-five per cent of the income tax; eighty-two

per cent paid none at all. Sherwood Eddy, in an article, "What Would a Christian World Be?" paints a revealing picture of our conditions. "We find," he says, "that in 1928, the last normal year for which we have statistics, there was enough income for all to have lived comfortably with an average of $3,745 per family. But instead, largely because of maldistribution, there resulted inequality, poverty, and unemployment. After 511 incomes of from $1,000,000 to $80,000,000 had skimmed off the thick cream at the top, after 15,780 persons with incomes of over $100,000, and approximately a million people with incomes over $5,000. . . . it did not leave enough skim milk to go round for the rest."*

With 511 incomes of from one million to eighty millions, with 15,780 incomes of one hundred thousand and above, you see where the large majority must necessarily come out—"at the little end of the horn." There is not enough rich cream for all. There probably could be whole milk for all. Frank A. Vanderlip, former president of the National City Bank of New York, says, "There is plenty of money in the country. The trouble is, the rich get too much of it, and the poor too little." Many are not even getting enough skimmed milk. According to Eddy, each family could have had, in our last prosperous year, $3,745. What did the majority have? In the auto industry, one of the most prosperous, the actual wage for all unskilled labor, was $1,200—$1,200 versus $3,700! And it is

* From "The Christian Century."

very certain that millions of families in America never reach the $1,200. They go below $1,000—$900, $800 and many as low as $600 and $500.

There has recently been a battle between the statisticians as to whether there has been an actual increase in wages, with the result that no appreciable rise was discoverable until after the war. We look at a few classes and professions, and that in a prosperous year, and then crow about the benefits to the worker under our present order.

We dare not hide behind the depression. The depression may be no more an abnormal result of our economic methods than were the days of great prosperity. Those were days of inflation for America; they were not for the rest of the world. These are days of depression for America; but they are far worse for the rest of the world.

Prosperity? Wealth? High standard of living? Yes, for a few, for the favored few who are lucky enough, in our competitive race, to be among the few. Why must it be a race?

The proponents of our system can offer no excuse for our conditions. Our depression is no answer. These facts I have been stating are concerning the years previous to the depression. It is my growing conviction that the depression is a natural result of our economic morality. Instead of being the excuse, it is the indictment. There is no alibi. In the United States we have had the largest and richest store of natural resources of any nation in the world. We have had a small population; and now it is near a standstill. We

have an energetic and capable people. We have had the world for our market. But, with all our resources, with the best of equipment to develop these resources, with the flower of the race, as we think, to do the developing, and with the world to sell to, the result is very low incomes—for the large majority. How we feel about this result may be too largely determined by whether or not we are among that majority.

Our economic morality has led to great inequality in influence and power. Do we realize the amount of power that accompanies those mammoth incomes? In his book, "Jesus or Christianity," Kirby Page says: "The prevailing economic system leads to the concentration of almost illimitable power in the hands of the few. Corporations are becoming more and more gigantic in size. We now have a dozen concerns with assets of a billion dollars each, and many more mount into the hundred million dollar class. The tendency all along the line is in the direction of concentration." Chain stores are developing rapidly. Banks everywhere are consolidating. One New York bank is the result of the merger of thirty-eight. Twelve New York banks hold directorates in ninety-two of our leading railroads. Some powerful individuals are directors of more than one hundred different companies. A Washington Daily recently said, "A single group of not more than 20,000 business men is in charge of American prosperity today." These 20,000 not only determine our major financial policies but also have great influence over our political,

educational, religious and social life. The press of the country is dominated by certain of these men. If we fail to realize this we may become badly warped in our thinking, especially on the problems of our economic morality.

Our prosperity is controlled by 20,000 men; and as a result, millions have no control. Millions have little power in developing and directing the policies of our national life. Is this helping to pauperize the masses? Do responsibility and power develop initiative and independence?

In our land of growing mechanical efficiency, coupled with a determination for profits, and with a morality which allows these profits to be in the control of the few, I believe that one of the essential results is unemployment. And in the measure that mechanical efficiency increases and control of profits centralizes, unemployment is going to increase. The official report in England, to which we referred, states that continuously increasing unemployment is the result of the price and profit system in England. Here is the problem which causes our economic leaders to stagger. We stand dazed before this tremendous issue. We can not see the way out. No one has suggested a final, positive solution. I repeat what I said in the first chapter, I see no possible solution in our present individualistic system. At a National Conference on Permanent Prevention of Unemployment, in Washington, D. C., it was said that our kind of prosperity manufactures unemployment progressively as it makes millionaires. In other words,

the terrible blight of unemployment is probably going to increase in its tragic effects, so long as we practice our present economic morality.

The corollary of unemployment is poverty. But even without unemployment, poverty is an inevitable accompaniment of millionaires. "Millionaires and Breadlines" is essentially correct. It has to be. I challenge anyone to show how one-third of one per cent can pay nearly all the income tax, or even how ten per cent can own practically all the property, and not have, as a necessary result, somewhere near eighty per cent living in poverty. We have seen that our prosperity is controlled by about 20,000 leading business men. This is the reason so few have part in it. How could it possibly be otherwise, as long as our morality says: Profits—profits by most any means—profits for him who can get them, to be used as he may dictate? We are blind if we can not see that our economic morality, which sanctions competition, declares sacred the pagan creed of acquisition, and honors the families living on their millions, necessitates poverty.

Poverty is coinciding with technical efficiency. The greater the efficiency, the greater the profits. And the greater the efficiency the greater the unemployment, and poverty. Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. Profits for some equals poverty for others, under our present system. This is the vicious result of our economic morality. The man who represented Germany in the Young Plan negotiations said, "A

capitalism which can not feed the workers of the world has no right to exist." Professor Irving Fisher estimates that five-sixths of our people do not have a cultural wage. An economic morality that can not provide this stands condemned by a world which we have seen knows enough and has resources enough to provide it. This is my next point.

Our economic morality prevents possible human welfare. Even if our system made profits for all, it would not therefore be justified. There is a greater test of economic procedure than dividends. I am not now the champion of any sentimentalism. We must have financial soundness and stability if our system is to stand the tests of a rigorous age. But we must have more than financial stability if our civilization is to endure. Wealth is more than money. Ruskin challenged England at this point by pointing to the real meaning of the word wealth. Wealth means the weal of the people—the welfare of all the people. The wealth of a nation is determined more by the human life produced than by the amount of goods produced. The economic processes of every society must stand this test or be condemned.

I fear that our processes do not stand the test. As we said in the first two chapters, there is not as much human welfare being sought as the machine technique and the science of management would now allow. Far greater welfare for all is easily possible. I am wondering if the very heart of the driving motive of industry does not lead in

exactly the opposite direction to the welfare of the majority of the people. I believe there is a fundamental clash here.

One of our leading bankers, Felix Warburg, says, "The causes of the depression can be boiled down to stupidity and cupidity." Stupidity is the inability to use the knowledge and resources already possessed by society. Cupidity, the Latin word for greed, is the unwillingness to use that knowledge and those resources. Inability and unwillingness, but mostly unwillingness, for society now has the ability to redeem her own life economically if she will.

There is a point of fundamental conflict between large dividends and social welfare. I am afraid that point was approached when, in 1930, certain key corporations paid dividends amounting to $318,000,000 above the year before, while the payroll decreased twenty per cent. I believe there will always be a conflict between human welfare and the motive of private profits. Nevertheless, men go on seeking to bolster up the present policy. Men seem determined to maintain the status quo, at least all the beneficiaries do.

Let me cite two examples of the extremes to which men will go in propping up a condemned and tottering structure.

The best remedy some can give for present conditions is that industry should produce less, until demand compels production. As long as price is determined by scarcity there is an effort to bring about scarcity. Therefore, produce less. Produce

less in a world of need? Industry has now been compelled to slow down while five-sixths of the population are still without the goods and conveniences of worth while living. Is not this enough to show the fundamental weakness of our economic arrangement, and of the morality that created and maintains that arrangement? Will we ever begin to question the profit motive? If industry can find no better suggestion than this, as a way to bring back prosperity, then certainly prosperity has little to do with human welfare.

Another foolish proposal is, that one way to return to prosperity—to increase consumption and start the wheels of industry turning—is for people to waste more, and thus find need for buying more. Waste is the hope of increased production. Teach the people to use all they possibly can. And our flood of advertising is doing it. Kenneth Burk, in "The New Republic," shows up the folly of such an economic philosophy. The more we learn to use what we do not need, the greater the consumption; and the greater the consumption, the greater the production; and the greater the production, the greater our prosperity. So we have a new doctrine —the doctrine of the economic value of waste.

This doctrine is already being practiced. Experts, for the good of the country, are said to be working to produce a razor blade which will give one perfect shave, and no more. Durability is the last quality which some manufacturers would build into products. It is a question if the carpenter, who builds a building to last too long, is most loyal

to the building trade. New models are a part of this economic philosophy. New models in radios, automobiles, and even in clothes, compel more buying. This new model technique is a scheme to build up a social psychology that will give support to the profit motive of industry. Anything to force the people to buy things whether they need them or not! And of course we need them to keep up with the Joneses. Must our profit-seeking economy resort to such, as a way out of our difficulties —make poor articles so they will wear out—change the styles so our pride will wear out—and thus, compel more buying?

All of this assumes that any possible solution must continue to put things into the hands of the few who have the money to buy them, instead of in some way getting things into the hands of the many who tragically need them. The high priests of the religion of prosperity seem able to propose most any sort of artificial policy that may help a bit to keep their religion in force; but they never seem able to think of the possibility of increasing the buying power of those needing the product. Is there no economic policy that will lift us out of this vicious and antisocial condition? And is there no economic morality that would support some such policy?

Our present system, which must resort to waste in a world of need, can never work. It can not stand. It is time to hunt another, or we may be left with none.

As a result of blocking possible human welfare,

our present system is losing its standing. And because some are determined to maintain the present plan when it is very evident that it is failing to give the maximum of human welfare, ill will is the result.

Our economic morality develops social friction. Why wouldn't it, when it stands in the way of the satisfaction of human needs? In many localities there is "battle to the death." There are strikes, boycotts, and picketing amounting to local war. Jealousy, suspicion, and hatred are the result. A strong class spirit is developing in America. The groups whose needs are denied, hate those who seem to be in the way of the provision of those needs. Those in the upper circles of society often seem to have a class consciousness, a spirit of disdain, and a superiority complex. A class conscious society can never stand in a democracy where its people are bred in the spirit of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The ill resulting from our present system extends beyond national borders. Our economic morality creates international ill will and war. A money making economy must make money. If the opportunities for big profits from natural resources are exhausted here, then the spirit of profits goes abroad. This is what we are doing. Our favored race now has political control over nearly nine-tenths of the globe, including one-half of Asia and all but one-thirtieth of Africa. We are going abroad to make money off the natural resources of other lands, whose people need the

profits far more than even our American workmen, to say nothing of the ones who get the profits. And so we force the peoples of the world to build and sustain our inflated standards of living.

Do we imagine this can long be done in an awakening world? Dr. Lock, a missionary to China, said, " We are great on no foreign entanglements. But how are we going to put a billion dollars on the Nile, and a billion dollars on the Kongo, and have no foreign entanglements?" He says that our markets will be flooded by twenty-five cents a day labor. But he is wrong there. We will pass more immigration laws compelling European and Asiatic labor to stay out of our land; and then we will proceed to fleece their land by means of our foreign investments.

It looks as if we are headed for trouble until we master the profit motive of our industrialism, which must of necessity have vital international involvements in our modern world. One financial journal is frank enough to speak of the serfs we have acquired abroad through our recent foreign investments. And I am ready to say that any economic morality that involves millions of serfs, whether at home or abroad, is headed for trouble and defeat. Slavery calls for rebellion. Men were created for freedom and power.

Our money culture, our inflated standards of luxury, must inevitably stand on the backs of the millions of the poor of the world—the millions of poor in America, and the multiplied millions of poor in other lands. Our economic morality does

not seem to be made for a world policy. It is for the select few of a select nation. And this fires the last shot toward its defeat.

It has not worked! It does not work! The very nature of its supreme objective essentially disqualifies it for a world of increasing interdependence of persons; so that I am ready to say, it can never work!

CHAPTER V

JUSTICE VERSUS CHARITY

Reverend C. T. Holman writes that on the last Sunday of 1930 he preached for Johnston Myers at the Immanuel Baptist Church in Chicago—"the church that meets every human need without delay." Reverend Holman says: "I have frequently seen Dr. Myers' breadline while on my way to Baptist preachers' meeting at Immanuel; a breadline of 1,500 to 1,700 men being fed daily. Men faint in the line from hunger and exhaustion waiting their turn.

"In this one church breadline alone, 1,500 to 1,700 men every day! And, in the afternoon, three hundred to four hundred women and children! And this, of course, only a small part of what is being done in Chicago to relieve the present desperate distress. All honor to Johnston Myers whose bulldog tenacity has held Immanuel Church in that neighborhood of tragic need, where the common people, whom Jesus loved, stretch out hands for help, but from which nearly all other churches have taken flight! And all honor to the church that he has been able to hold there, and lead in a ministry of redemptive and sacrificial service. Of course, many just criticisms could be made of the manner in which this service is rendered. It is, perhaps, not very scientificially man-

aged. But it is not for those who are making no mistakes because they are doing nothing, to offer criticisms. Much better than criticising would be to lend a hand. And the helping hand is needed at Immanuel.

"And yet, paradoxical as it may seem, I don't believe in breadlines! I never have felt so impatient with this whole method of dealing with the situation as when I have watched it operate. Is this the best that Christianity can do in the presence of human need? . . . "*

Shall they who love their fellow-men concern themselves primarily with drunkards or with prohibition, with the sick or with health education, with red cross work or the prevention of war, with the quelling of riots or the propagation of the gospel of love? Shall they work on symptoms or get at the causes of ill health? Shall they fight disease or build disease resisting constitutions? Shall our social servants, statesmen, religious workers, and all who seek to raise the level of the life of man, concern themselves with merely the symptoms of serious maladjustment in our social organism? Is the Gospel no more than a poultice or a pill?

We have quoted a leading British manufacturer as saying that up to the middle of the nineteenth century any intelligent industrialist could make one hundred per cent, and that three hundred per cent was possible. But we also saw that by this process

* From "The Christian Century."

sections of the British people were so damaged that all her later philanthropy and reform have not been able to restore their vitality. By the injustice of industrial oppression—taking the profits of the workman's labor even to one hundred per cent on capital—labor in England has been so pauperized that even the great British Empire can not solve the problems resulting.

England is in a serious condition. Only the dole spared her from revolution. And now she may not be spared. The dole at least delayed it. England still totters with tremendous problems resulting from industrial oppression. Injustice on a mammoth scale has created poverty on a mammoth scale in England. And something has created poverty, hunger and destitution on a mammoth scale in our own land. I believe the previous chapters have shown us what has done it.

At an Illinois State Pastors' Conference, Ivan Lee Holt, pastor of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church South, in St. Louis, told of talking with an industrial leader who said that his company had set aside six million dollars to have odd jobs done during the winter, in order to give employment to more men. "But," said this industrial leader, "I recognize that when spring comes we will be no nearer a solution of the great economic problems than before. We must provide for a fairer distribution of the profits of industry." Holt replied, "If a minister had said that you would have called him a dangerous socialist."

Industry may provide all the odd jobs possible,

and the heart of the problem will not be touched. She may even pay men for no work, and the heart of the problem will not be touched. Charity will not touch it. What the industrial leader told Holt is true. It is one of the hopeful signs of the times that some industrial leaders are seeing it.

We can never solve the tremendous problems of our industrial order until there is justice. We must have a fairer distribution of the profits of our entire industrial program. In his address Holt said, "A social vision for our day must contemplate, not a fair chance for anybody to get the big prize, but a more equitable distribution of the prizes." If a system of distribution gives some "big prizes," then there will have to be some small ones. The more the few get, the less the many can have; and this will never work. The world has tried to work it for five thousand years. Nearly every civilization we know has tried to work it. It has worked in none of them.

It can never work today. The days of inequality are numbered—political inequality and economic inequality. And here in the United States we are seeing that political freedom is a nominal affair, scarcely worthy of the name, when there is economic inequality. The declaration of political independence will not be signed until the declaration of economic interdependence is signed. Therefore I say, in this century of freedom, the days of economic slavery are nearing their end. The words, liberty, equality, and fraternity have been sounded, and they are ringing round the world.

When we approach the question, What would be a just society? there are two basic questions we should ask. First, who should get the greater share of the profits of industry? Second, how much can one man earn? And we should go on and ask a third: Should every man receive all he does earn? Does the mother? Does the teacher? Did Edison? Possibly. And yet, could he? Then should he? Does the artist receive all he earns? We paid two heavy weight boxers $2,000,000 for twenty minutes of entertainment while a Rembrandt masterpiece, which will live for centuries, sold for $3,000. I wonder if we ever could adjust wages to match service.

Fritz Kreisler says: "I was born with music in my system. It was a gift of Providence. I did not acquire it. So I do not even deserve thanks for the music. Music is too sacred to be sold. And the outrageous prices the musical celebrities charge today truly is a crime against society. I never look upon the money I earn as my own. It is public money. It is only a fund intrusted to my care for proper disbursement. I am constantly endeavoring to reduce my needs to the minimum. I feel morally guilty in ordering a costly meal, for it deprives some one else a slice of bread, some child, perhaps, a bottle of milk. My beloved wife feels exactly the same way about these things as I do. You know what I eat; you know what I wear. In all these years of my so-called success in music, we have not built a home for ourselves.

Between it and us stand all the homeless in the world."

Must every man collect all he earns? Did Abraham Lincoln? Did Jesus Christ? It is absurd! What would his wages have been? Maybe I had better not ask this question. I do not believe the world is ready to answer it.

We can ask the other two. We must ask these, for the millions are asking them; and they are demanding an answer.

The first is, Who should get the greater share of the profits? Dr. Ward, says: "The claim of the profit-taker is not morally validated unless the profit is divided to compensate all who have carried any of the risks involved. That means first, labor, which has hazarded life, limb, and working strength that lasts only for a time. In any rational society the risks of labor would be provided for first, for—as Abraham Lincoln once said—the interests of labor are prior to those of capital, because capital in general is created by labor in general; therefore, the material wealth of a nation can be more easily replaced than its man power. At present we are facing a bad situation of unemployment in certain industries in which big profits have recently been made, because of the theory that the risks of capital entitle it to all the net gain."*

How have we come to believe that money is more important than labor when labor is the creator of money? What are the risks in the invest-

* From "Our Economic Morality," by Harry F. Ward. By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

ment of capital—which was originally created by the risks of the workmen—compared to the hazards of life and limb, of mind and time, on the part of those same workmen as they create more capital? We can not settle this question here. It is one of the big questions of the book.

One capitalist has boasted that he and two other men borrowed ten thousand dollars to invest in securities, and that "by various manipulations" they had, in a few years, accumulated eighty million dollars. Ten thousand earned eighty million! Did it? Did they earn it? Notice, they themselves say, "by various manipulations." Not labor! Not hard work! Manipulations! Schemings! Somebody else did the work. Money is not made without labor; none of it is. If someone gets some he does not earn, someone else earns some he does not get. Did they earn it? No man can earn what two thousand ordinary men would earn at $2,000 per year. A railroad magnate can not earn $200,000,000 in ten years. He gets it. He takes it. He does not earn it. And I am ready to say, if any man can earn that much, he should not be paid in full. Is there no stewardship? Is service all bargain? If we try to pay the great servants of society their just reward in cash, we cancel their service with antisocial results; for no man can get a mammoth income unless many men get too little. Is there no other pay for a great servant of society? Does not society pay her really great in finer coin than gold? Those who scarcely earn must labor to collect.

Then what about our system of mammoth rewards for some? What about 15,000 incomes of $100,000 a year? What about 500 incomes of a million or more?

Because these mammoth incomes exist is no proof they should, and no proof they will continue to exist. We would not say, because eighty million of our people have not the commodities for wholesome living that it is a sign they should not have. And, in our present economic arrangement, the fact that they do not have these commodities comes a long way from proving that they have not labored to have them. Possession may have been, in the past, nine points toward proof of rightful ownership; but the nine points are decreasing. What is, is not necessarily right, because it is; though it is easy for most minds to follow the groove.

If small incomes are not proved right because they exist, mammoth incomes are not proved right because they exist. Certainly, by this time we should be able to see that some mammoth incomes necessitate many minute ones: millionaires spell breadlines. It is utterly impossible to have over five hundred incomes of over a million dollars, and at the same time all workmen get all they earn. It can not be done. Arithmetic has its lessons.

In order to think through this question on its merits we had better not consider incomes like Harry Payne Whitney's millions a year, while he did nothing but play polo and maintain his private yachts; nor like the railroad magnate who took $200,000,000 in ten years, and may have used

his brain to do it; nor any of those that have been made by "manipulating securities," which we have seen is the process that created millionaires so rapidly in recent years. We do not need to ask if these incomes are earned.

However, we must remember that they are paid. We must remember 28,000 new millionaires were created in fourteen years, and most of them by a huge system of gambling. Recall this when thinking about the unsettled conditions of these days. And many other facts should be put beside these. It is estimated by the Master Tailors that it takes $2,500 a year to clothe a gentleman. It takes more than that for Capone, with his $27 silk shirts and $8,000 worth of diamond-set belts. Many families are consuming each year enough to provide a wholesome standard of living for from fifty to five hundred families. We need to ponder facts like these when we get worried about present conditions. But we can not spend our time on these incomes of idlers and gamblers. There is no question here.

I want primarily to ask about the finest examples of large incomes. There is the Rockefeller estate with its vast income, controlled by an intelligent, social-minded philanthropist. He has given his hundreds of millions, and for good causes. He gives with intelligence. And there is the Carnegie estate with its benediction to millions through library service; and the Marshall Field endowment of the great Chicago Museum; and Julius Rosen-

wald's wonderful ministries; and many more. How about these incomes?

We are assuming that the use of these incomes is wholesome. We do not need to assume social-mindedness with some, their deeds prove this. We are assuming integrity in acquisition, though we probably need to do a little more thinking at this point. One millionaire, who is known as a church man and philanthropist, employs women and girls for $7 to $10 per week. Someone has said, "The very men who give freely to public ends, have driven their chariots over many corpses." However, we are not here questioning the recipients of these incomes. The question is concerning an economy which allows their creation. We are asking, not about men, but about an economic system, accepted and sanctioned by society, which allows such a distribution of the profits of industry.

Some immediately answer: We must have capital. Granted. But, capital before justice? And, who has proved that we can not have capital without its being individually owned and controlled? I say, justice first; then, if we can have capital in the hands of a few, all right. I cry for every worker of the world: Give me justice or give me death! The spirit of self-respecting manhood rebels against any form of injustice. All injustice is of the essence of disrespect.

Some answer: We need the development of the spirit of charity. Yes, we need much more than we have! And we will need far more than we will ever have as long as we have injustice. No

one knows what a just world would need. But as to the development of the grace of charity, if it is an admirable quality and a blessing to those who practice it, then maybe the millions need the chance to have a little of this grace.

The problem of big incomes is, Are dividends declared before labor is paid? What shall we do with the fact that the average family income could probably be two or three thousand dollars a year, while half of our families receive less than twelve hundred dollars? We pay twelve hundred dollars for unskilled labor—unskilled, but labor, and not one-half as enjoyable as the work which brings the large incomes. And who knows how skilled the labor might be, if it had the chance? Many men have no "pull." Millions have no chance at a "break." And yet, some talk about the freedom of the worker. Freedom? Yes, freedom to take the job offered at the wage offered or starve.

Twelve hundred dollars for unlikable, dangerous, unskilled labor! One hundred thousand dollars for a challenging, enjoyable, and commanding position! Million dollar incomes from inherited estates! Justice? Justice? Justice, where art thou? Justice does not answer!

What about it? Shall we have justice? Will it be justice, or will it be charity? Shall we have injustice with great need for charity, or shall we have justice with little need for charity? Shall industry steal and then give? Shall industrialists steal the just wages of men, forcing the millions into poverty, and then give to great relief pro-

grams? Or to state it the better way, shall industrialists take the profits of society's program of production, and then give back to society libraries, museums, hospitals, foundations, churches and schools? Or, shall men be paid in full, and then be allowed the privilege of spending their own money?

Let no one think we would have no libraries, schools, hospitals, and churches. We might have fewer fine ones, but more good ones. We even could have our great foundations and museums. But whether or no, let us give every man the privilege of spending his own money, the privilege of philanthropy and charity, if it is necessary, and especially the privilege of helping to build the finer things of our civilization. Let each man have the privilege of helping to build the civilization of which he is a part, and in which he needs to have a creative part. Harry F. Ward says, "The spoon-fed products of a culture dispensed as charity by well-meaning foundations are not likely to be the makers of a democratic society."* They are not likely to be the makers of any society. Is not this the weakness of every existing civilization—too many who can not appreciate it—who do not help to renew it—who are a dead weight on its future? We love the thing we help to build: we know its cost; we appreciate its value; we labor to preserve it; we catch some glimpse of how it might be better, and help to make it so.

* From "Our Economic Morality." Py permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

All men need power. They need the development and challenge that come from helping to build a better world.

The logic is evident. Let us have justice in the distribution of the profits of industry, that all men may have the joy of being the partner-creators of a better society. Either this, or the few will be compelled to practice charity in trying to save a tottering society. Justice and a better world, or charity and a tottering world! The choice is ours; now, but not forever!

CHAPTER VI

THE PARADOX OF OUR DEPRESSION

We are in a world depression. Most of the world is feeling it far more than America. China, India, and many other oriental countries have never known prosperity. Russia is poor, but is making a desperate effort to struggle out. Several European nations labor under enormous war debts, and a few approach bankruptcy. Germany is bankrupt and staggers near the border of revolution in her government. England is on the verge of bankruptcy and revolution. America struggles with a severe and long lasting depression.

What is the paradox of the depression in the United States?

We have wonderful factories and equipment for production. This is a land of great industrial development. Visit the large factories and industries of our land. They are truly marvelous. All honor to our great industrialists.

We have efficient engineers and managers—many of them. They are the best in the world. They can do great things.

We have raw materials. There is abundance of coal, iron, textiles, food stuffs, and all the materials necessary for the creation of goods. We have cotton, with a surplus that advises no production for a year. The legislature of Louisiana has legislated

against the planting of cotton in 1932, providing other states representing seventy-five per cent of the industry will enact similar legislation. We have oil wells which must be plugged because of over supply. We have wheat in superabundance. We have raw materials in abundance, and money to get them from other lands if more are needed.

We have workmen—millions of them. Millions are begging for work. They are good workmen. A large portion are skilled workmen. They can do far more than the workmen of most other lands.

We have factories and equipment. We have engineers and managers. We have raw materials to use in the factories. We have men to do the work.

And, we have need for the product. With two-thirds of our families living below a proper standard for wholesome living, surely we need the products of industry. At least eighty millions of our population are in need. I do not mean that eighty millions need bread. Is bread the measure of man's need? If we say the masses are not in need because they may not be in serious need of food and clothes, we are applying to others a materialistic standard. Two-thirds of our people are in great need of the agencies of enlightenment, culture, and spiritual living. Many of these tragically need the products of industry. Think of the tens of thousands in the slum sections of our cities, boys and girls without proper clothing, thousands of mothers and babes without proper food and wholesome housing, millions of men and women

lacking the necessities and conveniences of life. How fine it would be if these millions could own cars. They need them for a more worth-while existence. But the automobile industry must lay off men because there are already too many cars. How fine if the masses could have telephones, radios, electric washers, lawns, and libraries, and the thousand things which many of us deem necessities! Our own citizens need the products of our industry.

And the world needs these products. Name the countries of the world one by one—China, India, Korea, Japan, Turkey, Russia (She is buying far more from us than she sells to us), Germany, and most of the European countries, South America, Mexico—all need the products of American industry. This is not a world whose needs are supplied.

An editorial in "The Christian Century," entitled, "The Curse of Plenty," says: "It is about time for President Hoover to begin work on the preliminary drafts of his Thanksgiving proclamation. What will he list as causes for national rejoicing? Will he include the time-honored phrases about our bounteous harvests? Just now it begins to look as if American ingenuity was being principally devoted to finding a way to squirm out from under this very bounty. The situation in wheat has reached a point where there are many in a mood to thank God for the starving Chinese as possible absorbers of some of the surplus. That cereal sold on the Chicago market on August 29, at the lowest point since 1852; corn was lower

than for ten years past; oats and rye were lower than since 1896. All the result of a glutted market! Even the grasshoppers which have swept over certain portions of the northern cereal-raising states have been regarded as a very mild calamity—almost a blessing in disguise. Anything would be a blessing that protected the country against more bumper crops!"

Here is one paradox in our situation. A surplus of food in the presence of hunger! And that surplus is a great surplus; and that hunger is the hunger of multitudes. There are millions of bushels of wheat, with hunger here and starvation throughout the world. Vegetables must be dumped in the river because of overproduction, while children succumb to rickets. There is such a surplus of cotton that we must stop growing cotton, when at the same time thousands at home shiver with cold, and nakedness exists throughout the world. Certainly every sane man must wonder at such a situation. Mr. R. C. Jacobson, in a recent Kiwanis magazine, says, "A great many people are now wondering why there should be so much suffering and distress in the midst of plenty." That "why" will ring in the ears of men until it is answered.

Ernest Fremont Tittle says: "Today there is still enough bread to go around. There is indeed a surplus of wheat, a surplus of cotton, a surplus apparently of everything. There is plenty of bread to go around, but it is not going around! In our attempt to live by bread alone we have created an economic system in which, apparently, it can

not be made to go around even at a time when millions are starving. We see people hungry in a world where there is plenty to eat."* Sherwood Eddy has pictured the present condition as follows: "Today vast armies of men are unemployed because they have produced too much; they are hungry when they have raised too much wheat; they shiver with cold while we have too many textiles." This is a great paradox! Even primitive tribes would not manage their economic life so inefficiently.

Now I want us to see the larger paradox—the parodox of our total situation. We have factories and equipment, the best our nation can build. We have engineers and managers, the most efficient in the world. We have raw materials in great abundance. We have workmen crying for the privilege of working. And those crying for work are tragically in need of the products of their labor. In America alone there are eighty million in need—in great need of necessities for comfort, in tragic need of equipment for efficiency, in sad need of facilities for abundant living. Multitudes are reaching up bony fingers for bread! Workers are holding out unaided hands for tools! The masses cry out for the bread of life! The world is waiting for the means of comfortable, heroic, and noble living. The world is crying out for the products of our equipped and efficient machinery of production.

* From "The Christian Century."

But the wheels of that machinery are locked. In the face of tragic need the wheels will not turn. Millions are short of food, while the food producers are forced into idleness. Millions can not have clothing, while textile producers and laborers are compelled to cease production. Millions live in dingy, unsanitary, and crowded homes, while carpenters remain in unwilling idleness. And all the equipment for producing these things is at hand, but that equipment is idle. And there is plenty of money to finance the whole program, but that money is idle. Not long ago there was more than a billion dollars lying idle in our banks. Billions of dollars to operate our industrial machinery, millions of people seeking to help operate it, and hundreds of millions desiring the product, but there is no action. Are men fools?

Raymond B. Fosdick, formerly Undersecretary General of the League of Nations, says: "In a world that is bursting with goods, and that has limitless capacity to produce them, we are haunted by the spectre of compulsory idleness, with its bony fingers upon the throat of our industrial life. Apparently the problem of the machine age is not so much a problem of producing goods as it is of producing buyers. The unemployed are waiting for the flow of wages so that they can buy the goods they need; the manufacturers with idle plants are waiting for the consumers with sufficient money to start the wheels. All unwittingly we have stepped into a vicious circle." Get the force of this. The world needs more than we could pos-

sibly produce at capacity production, but plants are idle. The unemployed want these plants to go for the sake of wages and the product. The operators want the plants to go for the sake of profits. All want the plants to go; but they will not go! I have already quoted President Hoover on this point. When Secretary of Commerce, he said: "There is to my mind, no economic failure so terrible in its import as that of a country possessing a surplus of every necessity of life, with numbers willing and anxious to work deprived of those necessities. It simply can not be if our moral and economic system is to survive." We all say, "It can not be"; but it is! This is the great paradox of our depression.

And no one can measure the tragedy of it all. There is malnutrition from lack of food. There are dull brains from lack of educational facilities. There are uncultured minds from lack of books, pictures, travel, and all the means of culture. Warped souls, wrecked personalities, and embittered characters are some of the spiritual effects of our inefficient and unjust economy. Ill will, despondency, cynicism, and suicides are some more of the products of this great paradox.

Norman Angell, in an article in "Foreign Affairs" (London), writes: "The most disturbing fact which the post-war world faces is economic chaos. Where the standard of life was low, as in China and Russia, the chaos has resulted in famine, pestilence, death, and misery beyond imagination to conceive. Five million men, women, and

children it is estimated perished in a single province of China during the last winter from famine, disease, and cold. An American observer reports that in village after village the population was simply wiped out save for a few survivors eating grass, sawdust, dried leaves, tree bark, and leather. In industrial countries we get at present, not famine, but poverty for very many, inadequate life, and all the racking anxiety, and ultimately, the moral deterioration which must come from constant and heart-breaking unemployment. We face a monstrous paradox: the world needing more goods, and the men and machines which produce them standing idle." Everyone sees the paradox. It is a real paradox, for it appears impossible. It ought to be impossible!

I think it is time to ask one big question. Would this paradox be possible if the world was controlled by the world? Would a society-controlled society do it? Would a democratic economy do it? Or aren't we ready for democracy in our economic life? Can you imagine a socially controlled industrial system not operating in our present condition?

Why don't we operate? Why are not the wheels of industry unlocked at once? There can be but one reason. The millions have no money with which to buy the product. Remedy this, and the wheels will begin to turn. Our present system comes short; it remains far below capacity production at the same time that society's needs are still unmet, because those who need goods can not buy them.

Eugene G. Grace, president of Bethlehem Steel Company, says: "Business has come to realize that its success depends ultimately on the consumer. Purchasing power is the keynote of prosperity. We have made numerous improvements in production methods, but these are of little value unless we promote with equal care the ability of the public to consume. Good wages and continuous wages are the fundamentals of purchasing power. To protect its own market industry must protect the payroll." He must be right. Prosperity can never be steady, business can never be stabilized, and profits can never be certain without the steady and strong purchasing power of the working classes. There can be no question about this when it is realized that ninety-five per cent of all consumers are of the working classes.

Then, if this is true, something else is true. Cuts in wages lock the wheels of industry. And, therefore, cuts in wages make profits impossible. It appears that we may be compelled to use more business sense than we are now using. It looks as if the controllers of industry rob their own pockets when they take from the pockets of the workmen. If employers do not share the profits of industry enough to maintain the buying power of the workmen, they rob themselves as well as society. Selfishness ultimately commits suicide.

Do not conclude that I am totally blaming individual controllers of industry. We are caught in one vast system; and possibly the individual operator can help himself but little more than the

workman. There are many men of wealth and many captains of industry who are beginning to see the fundamentally serious condition we are in. Many of these same men are giving serious thought to the ways by which conditions may be improved. Some are seeing the basic requirement for fundamental improvement. I have quoted capitalists whose words give evidence of this. Many men of wealth are on the side of human welfare. It is true that most of them do not yet see an immediate way to remedy conditions. Their hands are more or less tied by the unwieldy nature of our commercialized society. As Worth M. Tippy says: "The employer lives in the present social order and is forced to work within its general scheme of things, just as the rest of us do. But, like the rest of us, he is called to enter into the building of a better order. Welfare work is not enough." In the measure that each individual operator continues to take all the profits possible for himself and does not build up the purchasing power of his own group of workmen, in that measure he is refusing to help in building a better order.

We are living in a system that is hard to change. No one and no group can change it. All of us could not change it in a day. But all can work constructively for a better system. And all had better work, for the fact can never be altered, that cuts in wages, or any unfair division of profits, will shortly cut those profits. Such a policy locks the wheels of the machine that produces profits.

This very interesting article appeared in the

business magazine, "Advertising and Selling": "We have been hearing a good deal recently of the incomes of certain highly coddled children of fortune. Eugene G. Grace of the Bethlehem Steel Company, for example, received in salary and bonus in 1929, the tidy sum of $1,623,753. Our old friend George Washington Hill of the American Tobacco Company is doing even better. His 'takings' last year exceeded $2,283,000. Whether or not these and similar incomes are earned is not here under discussion. But how much can you sell the recipient of such an income? An advertisement of tooth brushes might cause Mr. Grace to buy a half dozen; the same advertisement might cause each of two hundred people, employed by Bethlehem Steel, at a combined wage equal to Mr. Grace's income to buy a half dozen tooth brushes. An automobile advertisement might sell Mr. Hill one car, but if Mr. Hill's income was divided among three hundred people, the ad. might sell three hundred cars to the recipients of that income. All of which suggests a certain paradox in our distribution system. Aiming at distribution we have arrived at its antithesis, concentration. Well, what is the obvious remedy?"*

If business journals are beginning to write thus, we may be approaching, more closely than we think, some readjustment of things. Mr. Grace talked in this same way, as we quoted him a moment ago; but we note, according to "Advertis-

* Reprinted in "The Christian Century."

ing and Selling," that his own income was nearly two million dollars. What did Mr. Grace mean by what he said? Surely somebody somewhere was short. That will not unlock the wheels of industry. That will never build up the ability of all to buy tooth brushes. We must have more than talk. Talk will not unlock the wheels. Talk alters nothing until matched with action.

This business magazine suggested that there is an obvious remedy. That is our next question. How can we unlock the wheels of industry? How can we alter our great paradox? How can we step out of the vicious circle?

We have already answered it. There is but one answer. There may be several ways of applying the remedy, but there is only one remedy.

We said before: Can you imagine a socially controlled industry not operating in the present condition? Can you imagine the masses being able to say "Go," but actually saying "No"? With factories and equipment, with engineers and managers, with abundance of raw materials, with themselves begging for work, can you imagine these men, having part in the control of industry, and not starting operations at once? They would not even worry about profits. After all, is it not the chief desire of men to supply the needs of life? Who cares about money, except as it is an effective means of exchange—a way of getting the things he needs? And if men could get the goods they and their families need they would start operations immediately. There is no doubt at this

point. A socially controlled industrial system would operate. Then one sure way to unlock the wheels of industry is to let society be in control of industry. Hoover's commission of engineers has said that our production is only twenty-five to fifty per cent capacity. And I am saying that with five-sixths of our people in need, and with only one-fourth to one-half capacity production, these five-sixths, if they had any chance, would operate.

There is another way of applying the remedy. John P. Frey, economist, points out in "The Pathfinder," that while between 1922 and 1929 wages remained nearly stationary, corporate dividends, bank and bondholder profits more than tripled. Then he adds: "The failure of industry and commerce to pay wages in proportion to the wealth being created, resulted in lack of consuming power in the very markets in which the manufacturing industries were compelled to depend for the purchase of ninety-five per cent of their products." If manufacturing industries must depend on labor to consume ninety-five per cent of their products, why then do not the industrial leaders themselves, by methods which they would be able to find, lead out to increase the purchasing power of this large group of customers? Why don't they do it in their own interests? Why persist in the violation of the most fundamental and most evident of economic principles? Mr. William Guggenheim, a capitalist, says, "We need no Moses to lead us out of our plight. The cure is a simple one, for it merely is the application of common sense to

old and successfully tried principles." I do not know what Mr. Guggenheim means, but what he says is true. There is only one thing that will unlock the wheels of industry. There is only one thing that will keep them unlocked. It is a very simple and common sense thing.

But that one thing will cost. It has its price. It will cost the beneficiaries of our present system immediate profits. It may ultimately save their lives economically. A demand for profits now will keep the ninety-five per cent of the consumers poor, and thus prevent profits. What about such a demand, when it not only destroys its own fulfillment, but also denies the hope of a better world, in which men might realize the good and abundant life?

We have known these things in economic theory a long time; but we are now experiencing their truth and the inviolability of their working. We now see by bitter experience that there is a vital relationship between distribution of profits and the continuation of profits. There is an essential relationship.

Do not miss the second suggestion as to a way to apply the remedy—a way to unlock the wheels —a way to cancel the paradox. The quickest and easiest solution would be for the controllers of our industrial life, and the present recipients of the major profits, to begin to rebuild the buying power of the ninety-five per cent of all consumers who bear the heavy load in producing the goods of industry.

If we must wait on social legislation we may wait for decades. We know how slow is legislation for human welfare. Especially is such legislation slow when the legislators are the beneficiaries of the existing system.

If both of these ways should fail there is an ultimate course by which men secure their rights and supply their needs.

Let the controllers of industry meet the challenge. Let them save the day for the world, for human welfare, and for themselves. They can save the day for themselves—now, but not forever! In a land where human needs can be met, they will be met!

CHAPTER VII

IS AMERICA HEADED FOR REVOLUTION?

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the largest university of America, says: "Immense masses of food material are produced and no market is found for them, while not far away thousands upon thousands of human beings are in want of food. These are all familiar facts. The only possible reason for restating them is that nothing adequate or even earnest is being done in regard to the grave matters to which they relate. If we are effectively to allay discontent and successfully to remove temptation to disorder and revolution, we dare not sit indefinitely in contemplative inaction. The challenge is too peremptory and too ominous. Cool and detached contemplation will not do. Action is essential. Today progressive and enlightened liberalism is everywhere true conservatism. Stubborn resistance to betterment may well be the first step toward catastrophe."*

There is an increasing rebellion against an economic system which allows great luxury in the presence of starvation, and which permits a complete equipment for production to stand idle in the presence of tremendous need. There is a grow-

* From "The Christian Century."

ing rebellion against the injustice of the former and the absurdity of the latter.

As a further background for the discussion of this question let us take another bird's-eye view of the incomes of our citizens. In a recent year the wealth of our country was so distributed as to cause one-third of one per cent of the people to pay ninety-five per cent of the income tax. This means that if we would divide the people into three hundred groups, one of these groups paid twenty times as much income tax as all of the other two hundred and ninety-nine groups combined. There were over fifteen thousand with incomes of $100,000 and above and over five hundred incomes of from one million to eighty million dollars each.

The income of the vast majority of the people is far lower than we think. We have seen that the unskilled laborer in one of our most prosperous industries received, in a prosperous year, about twelve hundred dollars. I will venture the estimate, in the light of certain other figures, that nearly half receive eight to ten hundred dollars, and many as low as five and six hundred per year. Put all of this in terms of living standards—in terms of educational opportunity, in terms of social privileges, in terms of the material environment which accompany such incomes—and we have the facts that constitute the background of this question of revolution.

The Presbytery of New York recently appealed to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A. to provide for a study of

the causes and remedies of unemployment. In its preamble to this appeal the New York Presbytery says, "The Presbytery of New York affirms its belief that there is needed an economic reconstruction of society that will distribute economic goods more in keeping with the principles of justice and brotherhood." This is what the masses are thinking—that the total income is not distributed "according to the principles of justice and brotherhood." And if the masses believe this, and are being deeply stirred at the injustice of it; and if a Presbytery like that of New York is willing to take official action saying, "There is needed an economic reconstruction of society that will distribute the profits of industry with justice"; then maybe it is time we recognize that something ought to happen! Probably some changes should come.

Joseph R. Sizoo, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, D. C., says that peoples all over the world are living near revolt. He states that the total wealth of the world is four hundred twenty-five billion dollars, and that forty-five per cent of this is controlled by the United States. Sixty-five per cent of this amount is in the hands of three per cent of the people. It is because of this radical injustice and inequality in the division of the world's goods that the peoples of the world are living near revolt.

These facts rather definitely suggest the way to have revolution. The way is evident and easy. It is to do nothing about these facts and conditions.

And we must remember that what Dr. Butler said is too nearly true; nothing in earnest is being done about it. But if the leaders of society and of the government do not do something about it the masses may. The masses will! L. Foster Wood, in "The Christian Century," writes, "When great masses of men find themselves and their families without bread, in a world where others find an easy road to luxury, they are likely to do something about it." The lesson of history is, they do do something about it!

America had better not close her eyes to these lessons of history. The peasants of France did something about it. The feudal system, by which profits and property were possessed by the few, was working such havoc and misery with the peasants of France that rebellion had to come. Men will not stand for great injustice forever, when that injustice means poverty and misery for their loved ones.

The working classes of Russia did not stand for it. A woman of the intelligentsia of Russia said: "You must understand that for centuries, what the Russian workers earned was the property of the Czar, the nobility, or the church. So little was left for them that they lived unspeakably. Joy for them was nothing but vodka." One writer in Russia says: "To reach the Czar's former palace, about fifteen miles from Leningrad, one traverses a cobbled road which is lined with miserable peasant huts, squalid, weather-beaten, and unkempt. There isn't a single house in the whole fifteen

miles which might soften the contrast between imperial splendor and miserable poverty. That was the Russia of old." "One must understand these old contrasts," this writer says, "if one would appreciate the hatred with which the revolutionists pursue the merchants, the old nobility, and the priests who were allied with them. It is a hatred conceived in Marxian dogma, but what gives it a vitality which class hatred has achieved nowhere else is the bitterness which the centuries of oppression distilled in the hearts of the peasants and workers."

In his book "The Clash of World Forces," Basil Matthews writes: "By 1914 two and a half million of illiterate employees, men and women, for the most part overworked, underpaid, vilely housed, and often wickedly exploited by overseers, were seething with discontent against their growingly rich employers." This was the condition in industry. The agricultural conditions were worse. Two hundred thousand owned more than one-fourth of the land, including most of the best soil, while many millions of the peasants could scarcely exist in their wretched poverty. Over sixty per cent of the people were illiterate. Paul Hutchinson in "World Revolution and Religion," says: "The revolution broke out early in Russia, and took drastic forms there, because the former order there had become an impossible one for human life to endure longer." Hutchinson adds: "The injustice against which the Russian revolted is the injustice which rowels the common man in every land; the

dream of a society of equitably shared benefits, which the Russian has set out to attain, is the dream which haunts the mind of the common man in every nation." *

Oppression and injustice continued long enough is certain to bring revolution. Mr. Spencer Miller, speaking at the Episcopal Convention at Denver, said: "The present depression is not just another turn in the business cycle—it is the end of an era and the beginning of a new. As the historian looks back upon our present predicament, and sees the way in which the great depression followed inevitably upon the great war, he will be amazed at our inability to read the signs of the times. He will find far greater parallels between the changes through which we are passing and those great changes of social and political revolutions in England and France, than in any depressions from 1857 to the present time in the United States." † Are we going to let history repeat itself? This depression is more than a depression. It is the symptom of an undercurrent in our social order that presages far more than a come-and-go period of hard times. The crisis of our American civilization is here. It was not here in the eighteen-seventies. It was not here in the eighteen-nineties. It is here today because there have developed certain fundamental characteristics that are more than injustice—that are positively contradictory and suicidal. Such an order must be revolutionized.

* Copyright 1932. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.
† From "The Christian Century."

Injustices are enough to bring revolution; our present practices compel it.

No one can say we do not have many great injustices. The vast contrast in incomes, with all that this means, is evidence enough. There are people who annually consume from ten to five hundred average family incomes. Some have million dollar playhouses, while millions of children nearby are without sufficient chance to play any wholesome game in a clean and safe environment. The million dollar playhouse is very rare of course, but how about a $5,000 one? And how about a $10,000 garage? I have seen many a garage in the suburbs of our cities, that would make a palace of a home for many children.

A page from a Sunday paper a few years ago is entitled, "Where society prays and weeps on the graves of dogs." It tells of women sobbing over marble mausoleums and granite headstones of departed pets. It is concerning the canine cemetery in Westchester county, New York, for dogs and monkeys and other pets of the millionaires of New York. The headstones range in price from $500 to $2,500, and the mausoleums cost $10,000 or more. This is only one of the many whims and fads for which the wealth of society is being spent. It is a dangerous crime against society for dogs and monkeys to be buried in $10,000 mausoleums while thousands of little children cry in hovels not fit for curs. Men tamper with the foundations of their society when they spend their thousands on passing whims while tens of thousands of their

brother-men are without the necessities of life. "The World Tomorrow" says, "Auditors of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington report that the famous party which Mr. H. L. Doherty of Cities Service threw there in honor of his adopted daughter, cost him a cool million dollars, or in other words, $500 for each of 2,000 guests. Whether or not this estimate is accurate it would be difficult to discover, but certainly it must have cost Mr. Doherty a pretty penny to stuff his 2,000 merry-makers with squab and other delicacies and then entertain them with an entire musical comedy whose cast he brought down from New York in chartered airplanes. In these days of breadlines and starvation such an expenditure of money is something worse than mere ostentatious vulgarity." Mr. Doherty has tried to defend his actions by the time-honored argument that his party gave work for many people. So would the act of a man who burns a great city building.

Many acts like Mr. Doherty's are the sure road to the rebellion of the masses. Let things like this continue and the flames of revolution will leap all bounds. If society continues to keep from the workers of the world their share of the world's goods, and allows that share to go for the support of idle loungers and vain spendthrifts, the law of revolution will operate.

I do not know how much we may expect the crushed millions to endure. An article in "The Christian Century" presents a real challenge to our present society: "Let us imagine a fertile and

pleasant island entirely cut off from the rest of the world. Let us suppose that its population consists of about one hundred people divided into twenty-five families. The island produces more than enough to supply the wants of all. A very few own most of the land and property; the majority own a little; a good many own nothing. Roughly speaking, one half works for the other half on wages and has no means of living except on current earnings. Then it comes about, for reasons nobody quite understands, that the hiring half no longer cares to employ all the hired half; perhaps can not; at least does not. Four of the heads of families and two or three others can not get work; therefore they can not buy food; therefore they can not eat. They are not allowed to raise food for themselves, because someone else owns the land. They are not allowed to catch fish because someone else owns the water and the shore and the boats and the nets. Just what would a reasonable observer expect the hungry twenty to do? One or two perhaps may make trivial little jobs for themselves which will wheedle a few pennies from the whimsically generous among their fellow-islanders. Some may beg. The rest must starve. There is no other alternative short of unlawful methods, for the laws of the island are very strict in protecting property. Multiply the figures by a million and you have the situation in the United States. What would a reasonable and unbiased observer expect the six million unemployed and the twenty million hungry to do?

There is little enough that they can do without having recourse to methods destructive of those 'property rights' upon which we consider the social fabric to rest. To say that the hungry can not be expected to prefer starvation to theft is not to encourage disregard for property rights. It is to say that the only way to preserve property rights is to prevent this dilemma between theft and starvation from arising. There is little that the hungry can do to prevent it. Those who have property must do something not only to save the starving but to save the social order and to protect the sanctity of law from a strain which it can never stand."

Speaking at the Forty-sixth Annual Convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, President William Green said: "The time has come when industry must make momentous decisions. They must decide whether we are to have a better balanced social and economic order under the prevailing political philosophy that exists in America. They must decide whether they are going to make that possible, or whether, on the other hand, they are going to face an overwhelming avalanche of unrest and social discontent, face to face with a hungry army that knows no rules and when driven to desperation will upset the existing order and substitute something else instead." He asked, "Can the wealthy and the financiers feel secure in their own homes when millions are hungry?" The workers of the world are thinking in the terms of the man who represented Germany in the Young

Plan negotiations, who said, "A capitalism which can not feed the workers of the world has no right to exist." And Mr. Norman, governor of the Bank of England, said, "Unless drastic measures are taken to save it, the capitalist system throughout the civilized world will be wrecked within a year." If groups of socialists would make such statements as these, we would say, Jail them; they are reds. But these are world bankers talking.

Let me suggest here the importance of maintaining freedom of speech on all these questions. I say this because I do not want revolution. I want us to prevent it. One of the best ways to hasten revolution is to prevent labor and the underprivileged groups, freedom of speech, of assembly, and of organization. Mr. Worth M. Tippy, a representative of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, says: "A spirit of intolerance towards differing opinions has been growing in the nation since the world war. To preserve these traditions and constitutional American liberties is of the utmost importance. It is especially necessary to keep a free and courageous pulpit. Congregations need to be trained to expect their ministers to speak frankly so long as they are considerate of those who listen to them. Labor has the right of collective action. Article II of the Social Ideals of the Churches, states that the churches stand for 'the right of employees and employers alike to organize.' A similar statement appears in the pronouncements of most religious bodies. Without organization labor is impotent to

protect itself against abuses, or to share in the constructive development of industry, or to influence legislation, or to take its rightful place in the life of society. Employers use and enjoy the right of association with only the restraints of public law. Employees should enjoy the same rights under like restraints." In his epoch-making book, "Christianizing the Social Order," Walter Rauschenbusch says: "If we could pick out a thousand employers who in some way have been conspicuous for their opposition against organized labor, put them all in one mill town together, subject them to the average conditions of industrial workers, leave them just as able and energetic as they are now, but somehow deprive them of the hope of escaping from this condition and lot, they would have a rampant labor organization in running order inside of a week, and the world would listen to an explosion before a month was up. If they could no longer use the physical force of constabulary, deputy sheriffs, Pinkertons, and militia, they would fall back on their own physical force, and organizers of the Federation of Labor would come in to counsel steadiness and peaceable methods."*

There is such a thing as modern slavery; therefore, labor must have the chance at free discussion and united action. Dr. Harry Ward says: "Is not the essence of slavery still with us in certain of our wage and tenant relationships? When an outworn method of handling the affairs of society too long walks beyond its time, sudden and drastic

*By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

change is unavoidable."* Dr. Ward suggests that the extensive use of force today to prevent discussion of social change, reveals "the number and power of those who have possessions and privileges which they wish to protect for their children, regardless of what that means to the rest of society." "Regardless!" That is the real danger of this hour! Not that there are socialists in America! But that there are many "who have possessions and privileges which they wish to protect for their children regardless of what that means to the rest of society." This will be the cause of revolution if it comes! Not bolshevists! Not socialists! If these groups are able to win converts in America it is because some of the conditions which give such sentiments a chance to grow, exist here. We are shallow in our thinking. If a boil comes on the body, do we try to cut out the boil? It will not help to cry: Bolshevism! Socialism! Communism! We need to see if our national blood is clean. I am not arguing for bolshevism and socialism. Do not mistake me here. I am seeking to suggest some things that may prevent the boils of our body politic from causing blood poison.

We do not want revolution. The cost is too great. As one historian said of the French Revolutionists, "What to them were legalities?" Laws will not curb their actions. Laws seem to them only to protect and preserve the very injustices which they fight. And often they are right. Gov-

* From "Our Economic Morality." By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

ernment police force at first may quell rebellion, but is finally of no avail. Police force seems to revolutionists to be the right arm of the oppressor; and the history of revolution says they are correct. The history of the revolutions of the world have many things to say to him who will read that history. Paul Hutchinson, in "World Revolution and Religion," says: "Revolution is all that the word implies. It is taking this world of ours—this nice little settled comfortable world with all the jimcracks of our civilization so nicely placed upon the mantels of our complacent enjoyment—and turning it upside down, so that that which has been on the bottom stands on the top, and so that all our expensive and fragile bric-a-brac falls into fragments and forms part of a vast debris."* Revolution is a dangerous way to correct the evils of society. As one of the leaders of the French Revolution said, "Revolutionists know how to be free, but not how to be just." Often there is very little justice in the actions of those who fight for justice. Revolution is a rough and rocky road. No sane man wants society to take this road.

But the sane men will have to lead down some other road. Reinhold Niebuhr, writing of "The Crisis in British Socialism," makes this statement: "It is one of the ironies of history that privileged groups should be honestly affronted by the class-consciousness of laboring groups, which they regard as a peril to the state, while they do not realize how much their identification of their own

* Copyright, 1932. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

interests with the welfare of the state is the very root of the proletarian mood."* Those who create the mood of the revolutionists must take the first steps to correct that mood. And they can not do it by giving the laborers and the sufferers in the present system circus rides and a hand-out. The masses of America are too intelligent for this. One writer says that when the wage earners see how little the prospect is that their children will ever be able to rise above their social level they will rebel. And they see it now. Edwards in his "Natural History of Revolution," shows that while intense deprivation may cause sporadic outbreaks, yet effective revolution generally comes through those who have had enough improvement in their conditions to create an appreciation for a better life, but who are denied any further realization of their natural and rightful longings. Possibly the best kind of soil for revolution exists in America.

The masses of other lands are seeing the injustice of things as they are. This is the basic reason revolutions are occurring all over the world. Dr. Locke, a missionary to China, said that he asked a coolie who was firing a blast furnace in China if he had ever heard of Jesus. "Yes," he said. "Are you interested in him?" Dr. Locke asked. "Yes." "What is your special interest in him?" "To know if the coolie who fires the furnace gets his share of the spoils." And then Dr. Locke said, "Either the church will help solve our economic problems or the Bolshevists will do it for us."

* From "The Christian Century."

There is a better way than letting the Bolshevists do it for us. There is a better way than revolution. There is a better way than violence. H. G. Wells in his "Outline of History," says, "It is only by law, education, and the spirit of love in the world, that men can be made happy and free." This suggests the wisdom of Gandhi's method of passive resistance to evil as possibly the best or only certain way to overcome evil. Wells is right; and Gandhi may be right. It takes patience and wisdom to right the wrongs of a world.

Unemployment is on the increase. Its increase appears inevitable. The poor continue to suffer in poverty while many of the rich revel in extreme luxury. The rich hold sway over many of our institutions and national policies. To the laboring man they appear to block all possibility of any righting of the wrongs of our order. There is little promise of remedy. The masses do not see that deep seated evils of a complex social system can not be changed in a day. Will they wait? It all depends on what is done, and how soon.

I have tried to describe the way to have revolution. Surely the way to avoid it is evident. There is no need of mincing words here. Society as a whole must get busy supplying human need. And it can not be done unless many give up what they do not need.

Will this be done? Marx, the founder of socialism, insisted that the possessing classes will never voluntarily surrender their privileges. It is a fact

of history that no privileged group has ever voluntarily divested itself of power and privilege without pressure from below. The nobles, and even the clergy of France, held tenaciously to their privileges. The Czar and all beneficiaries of the old order in Russia, including the church, held on to the system that gave them special privilege. No wonder the new Russia has nothing for the church. It is one of the black spots in the record of the Christian church, that so often it has been the beneficiary of an evil system, and therefore sounded no voice against that evil. What about the American churches? Are they free to challenge economic injustice?

Dr. Fosdick is one of the ministers who seems free to challenge injustice today. In his widely circulated sermon, "The Ghost of a Chance," he points out the necessity for basic changes in our industrial order. Capitalism, he said, is on trial with communism as its world competitor. He pled with the business leaders of his own congregation and of the entire country to be realistic and make the necessary changes before it is too late. Nonviolent revolution is possible in a society providing those who hold power and privilege are willing to share that power and privilege, and are willing to share it in time. There is a price to pay and a time to pay it. Lincoln said that a people have the right to overthrow their government by revolution if they can not change it by other means. Right or no right, the lesson of history is that they do it.

I have referred to Mr. Miller's message to the

Episcopal Convention in Denver. He received extended applause for the following words: "The present economic and social revolution may either be allowed to explode or be constructively guided." We need to recognize that we are now having a world revolution. The question is, what kind will it be in the future—violent or gradual and constructive? The world is changing. The crucial question now is, how will it change? Must it be suppressed into violence?

This challenge of Mr. Miller's is the challenge that many leading ministers, educators, and social leaders of America are sounding today. The challenge is to those in places of privilege and power to do something now! Andre Maurios, in "The Forum," in an article, "Can Capitalism Be Saved?" says that capitalism can avoid a revolution, but that it can do so only by transforming itself.

Dr. Fosdick says: "We still have a chance to build a humane and decent economic life that will minister to the welfare of all people. I do not see how any one can look across the world today without perceiving that it is a narrow chance. For see the picture: communism rising as a prodigious world power and all the capitalistic nations arming themselves to the teeth to fly at each other's throats and tear each other to pieces." "The decision between communism and capitalism hinges on one point. Can capitalism adjust itself to this new age? Can it move out from its old individualism, dominated by the selfish profit-motive, and so create a new coöperative epoch with social plan-

ning and social control, that it can serve, better than it has, the welfare of all the people? If it can, it can survive."

Is America going to refuse to profit by the lessons of history? If we do not constructively and enthusiastically labor for the reformation of our present system, we contribute to its overthrow. If we block evolution, we bring revolution.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGE OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

Vienna, the capital of Austria, with a population of nearly two million, has had socialist rule for thirteen years. It is the largest city in the world under the rule of socialism.

Vienna's program includes city ownership and management of public utilities, gradual purchase of land in the city, municipal housing, and municipal hospital and funeral service at cost. At the present time the city is engaged in sixty or more enterprises, chiefly of the building and construction type, but including agriculture, afforestation projects, bakeries, and laundries. By virtue of the city's holdings it appoints many directors in private companies. The three so-called monopolies are transportation, gas, and electricity. They are providing gas twenty-two per cent cheaper than before the war. Light costs five cents per kilowatt. Electricity for power is one-half the cost of light.

They have a program of good housing. The city owns the houses. It has built thousands of sanitary homes, thus solving their slum problem. It rents them at very low rates, not seeking to make interest on the money. An ascending scale of rents is charged for the finer homes. Before the days of socialism the average rent was about

one-fifth of one's income; now it is about one twenty-fifth, and that for better houses. The city government regulates wages, protects the workman against arbitrary dismissal from work, and provides for incapacity, old age, and sickness insurance.

The entire program penalizes private property and strives to reduce personal wealth. Taxes come heavy on the rich, and very heavy on luxury. For example, there is a heavy tax on extra servants. They pay nothing for one, $7.50 for the second, but for every additional servant the employer pays $37.58 on top of the cost of the immediately preceding one. This means that Rothschild paid, in 1927, $46,550 for thirty-eight servants. This is typical of their effort to let wealth carry the large part of the program of city welfare.

The question immediately arises, how does such a plan work financially? Thirteen years are not enough to test it. It seems to be succeeding. Remember, Vienna is a city of nearly two million. In 1919, when socialism took control, the city was almost bankrupt. It has carried on its vast program, with a great increase of city resources. And the tax in 1928 averaged $23.33 per capita. This, as we have seen, falls heavy on the rich and especially heavy on luxurious phases of living.

I talked with a physician, who recently spent six weeks in Vienna studying medicine. He is of the opinion that they are probably raising the standard of living for the masses more than they can maintain. But he also testifies that the laboring classes

have a new interest in life, and many of the beneficiaries of the former system are becoming enthusiastic for their socialistic system. They are learning to find joy in the enriched life of all.

In certain other European countries, such as Denmark, the application of some socialist principles, and their successful working, are revealing the possibilities of coöperation on a national scale. Results are beginning to show that the level of the life of a people may be greatly raised by a coöperative system. The results are sufficient to present a considerable challenge to our competitive system of private profits and private control.

Communism is presenting a similar challenge.

Communism is not new. An approach to it existed in the apostolic church. Mild forms of it existed among the early orientals. Our own transcendental movement was communism of a voluntary and non-militant type. This type is now present in several localities in the United States. Was not our government approaching a non-voluntary type during the world war? There are some communistic features in every system. Communism is no new invention. It did not originate in Russia.

Study the chief example of communism on a large scale, and where it is least hampered—the communism of Russia. We should recognize, however, that there is no pure communism in existence anywhere. Russia has a mixture of communism, socialism, and capitalism. They are headed for pure communism, but find it necessary gradually to approach their ultimate goal.

It is advisable to read as widely as possible of this great experiment. If one depends on the daily press he will be badly warped on the question. The press is largely subsidized. It has become a financial institution. Money dictates many editorials and determines the slant of much of the news. Propaganda against Russia is rampant. For a rather thorough knowledge of the Russian system there is now available considerable excellent literature.

We can not discuss the many details of Russian communism. We have limited our subject to the economic phase and must confine our discussion to it. Therefore, we shall not endeavor to offer an opinion on communism as a complete social system. We seek to study only the one phase enough to get its message for our economic order.

It is time that we open our prejudiced eyes to what Russia is doing. I refer now to her economic program, which is the heart of communism. Her moral and religious views, and even some of her political and economic policies, are more or less incidental to her essential objective. We are being compelled to give attention to her major economic theories. Sherwood Eddy, who has been for years a student of world affairs, having visited Russia six different times, twice under the old regime and four times under the new, is considered one of the most discriminating and unprejudiced writers on Russia. In his book, "The Challenge of Russia," Eddy says: "When the largest country in the world, embracing nearly one-sixth of the habitable

land area of the globe, attempts the boldest experiment in history, something tremendous is bound to happen, whether for good or evil, or more probably, for both good and evil. And when such a thing occurs, which is bound to have consequences both wide and deep, we would do well to try to understand it as objectively and dispassionately as we can." *

In his recent book, "Business Adrift," Dean Donham, of the Harvard School of Business, says that Russia "is trying a great economical and social experiment which will have the most serious repercussions first in Western Europe and then on us." Calvin B. Hoover, professor of Economics in Duke University, in his book, "The Economic Life of Soviet Russia," says, "The significance to the capitalistic world of developments in the Soviet Union can not be exaggerated." † Maurice Hindus, himself a Russian, and one of the best authorities on Russia, says in an article in the "Ladies' Home Journal," "The five year plan is the most momentous fact in the world today. Nothing like it has ever happened in the history of mankind." It is evidently important that we know about this tremendous experiment.

The task the Revolutionists had to do and the obstacles they faced in doing it determined their plan and procedure. We noted in the last lecture some of the conditions that were the cause of the

* All quotations in this Chapter from Sherwood Eddy are from his late book "The Challenge of Russia," copyrighted, 1931, and are reprinted by permission of the publisher, Farrar & Rinehart, Inc.
† By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

Russian Revolution. The communist program is an effort to throw off the slavery of the old regime and to reconstruct the wrecked remains of centuries of oppression. It is a determined effort to set up a system of economic and political control that will accomplish this task and prevent any possibility of such oppression being repeated. Is it not logical that they would adopt some form of group or national ownership and control? This is what they are doing on a far more complete scale than it has ever been done by any nation.

The five year plan is a great national program to change, as quickly as possible, a backward, undeveloped people, into a modern industrial nation. They are taking the course of the socialization of all industry and of life to do this. According to Eddy, "All the land and natural resources, more than ninety per cent of industrial production, all foreign trade, railways, large banks, and more than nine-tenths of the total trade turnover are already socialized." The government, which is the communist party, is acquiring possession of nearly everything—mines, mills, restaurants, barber shops, beauty parlors, and taxicabs. In some cities medicine has become a government affair. Physicians are employed by the government, as are coal miners and ditch diggers. They are endeavoring to coördinate and unify all production and distribution. It appears that they will, by this coördinated national program, be able to increase their production in major industries from 150 to 400 per cent in the five years. Their basic capital has

doubled in three years. They are undertaking to set aside one-half of the national income for programs of greater production. During the five years they will probably invest fifty billion dollars in equipment for increased production. And they are doing it alone, without foreign loans, and during a world depression.

During this vast program, hours of labor are being decreased; and wages, though still low, are being increased. There is a definite limitation of the income of the individual, but there is not absolute equality. Income is based on service rendered and the needs of the individual. Russia is overcoming such extreme inequalities as exist in other systems.

Russia's method of inaugurating her new order was by the destruction of the capitalistic system. She had seen that nearly every civilization of history, being built on private property, had developed into great inequality, ending in downfall. She saw the trend of the present capitalistic systems, and therefore did not trust private ownership and control. Her method of destroying the old system was the only method left to use. It was the same the French used in overthrowing the Bourbon autocracy—the same by which the American Colonies threw off the control of England—the method of revolution. The communists contend that force must be used, because they believe, as Marx taught, that the possessing classes will never voluntarily surrender their privileges. We saw in the last chapter that it has never been done. The commun-

ists take the ultimate course for a better world, and they make no delay in doing it. They believe that revolution is the only method that will get results in our present world.

The Christian nations do not differ from the communists in the use of force. They use it to maintain present conditions, which conditions we have seen are often positively evil. But, some one says, the nations use force in the regular legal way. If this point is pressed there is no room for any reform in methods of government except by Gandhi's method. Sons and daughters of a country that was born of revolution should be able to sympathize with the method of the Russian people. We have nothing to say against the use of force by the communists. One writer says: "Nothing good can be said for the hypocrisy of our world which uses force for the maintenance of social inequality and then professes itself horror stricken by the use of force for the maintenance of social equality."

Sherwood Eddy asked a member of the old nobility of Russia, a prince, and of course a beneficiary of the old regime, who is now serving wholeheartedly in the workers' republic, two questions: "How can you, with your past special privileges be content to work for the party maximum of two hundred and twenty-five roubles a month, or $3.75 a day, which is less than an unskilled worker would get in the Ford Motor Works? And how can you, as a gentleman, a man apparently of humane consideration for your fellow-men, support a policy of

world revolution? To put it bluntly, why do you communists want to kill people?"

His answer was substantially as follows: "You ask why I should be content with such a meagre income? But why should I not be? All my wants are provided for. I have three ample meals a day. More would make me ill. I can wear but one suit of clothes at a time. I have an excellent roof over my head and no discomforts of which to complain. But suppose I had. What satisfaction can the amassing of money or mere private profit give? Why should such a cheap and ignoble pursuit even interest us? We are building not only a new Russia, in contrast to the old order, but a new world. We seek a world of justice for the workers and the release of their creative energies. Is that not a worthier goal, a more thrilling adventure, a deeper satisfaction? Certainly it is for me.

"But you ask: Why do we want to kill people? Do you really mean that such is your conception of our system? I am sorry that there were some people killed in our Revolution. They were relatively few, for it was almost a bloodless conflict until the outbreak of counter-revolution, the sabotage of the old classes of privilege, Allied intervention and the invasion of our country. If I remember rightly, there were some people killed in your own American Revolution which lasted for seven years after 1776. I am sorry, but people have a way of being killed in revolutions. I suppose it is a necessary evil.

"The skillful surgeon who performs a dangerous operation at the risk of life and often with the certainty of giving pain, does not do this because he wants 'to kill people' or to cause suffering. He is trying to save life and he knows of no other way, in the last resort, than a dangerous and painful surgical operation. So it is with revolution. We know of no other way, for all other ways have failed. They are failing still in the continued social injustice after all these centuries in your capitalistic countries.

"And you seriously think that we want to kill people? Frankly, we thought that you were the killers. Take your recurring capitalist and imperialist wars; your World War, your pestilential slums. Do you know the death rate in the slums of your own city of New York? I was in America investigating. I have written a book upon it. Think of the more than six hundred thousand darkened tenement rooms of your city, where your slums continue, generation after generation, in tenements, many of them long ago condemned as unfit for human habitation. And yet you go on profiteering out of them just as we did in Czarist Russia. And you will never destroy them. You will never give them justice any more than we did in old Russia. How many little children are you killing, with your high death rate in your slums, decade after decade?

"And, take again your World War. How many did you kill? Was it ten million young men at the front? Did not Russia alone lose more than three

millions? And how about the non-combatants? Add the women and children, and all told was it not twenty-six millions that was your death roll? Compare with that the handful killed in our Revolution during a few days of street fighting, until the capitalist world and the imperialist nations invaded our country to back up the forces of the reactionary Czarist regime that were against a workers' republic. In the light of all these facts, can you seriously talk of our wanting to kill people? No, we believe that a swift surgical operation, even though necessarily at the risk of some loss of life and of pain, will actually save life, compared to the continuing slums with their high death rate, the widespread unemployment, the inevitable and recurring wars of competitive capitalism and conquering imperialism. In the light of all the facts I would ask, who are the killers, you or we? Neither of us want to kill people. But, I repeat, who is doing so today, you or we?"

The results of this tremendous experiment can not be known for some years. It will be a century before the world can see the ultimate outcome of their policies. Andre Maurois, in "The Forum," says: "Engineers and capitalist manufacturers who have been in Russia for as much as a year, come back, not converted, but surprised. Themselves builders of factories, they can not help admiring those giant plants which Russia is constructing." Basil Matthews in "The Clash of World Forces," says, "Bolshevism is the greatest experiment ever made to fulfill the dreams of bring-

ing in a Golden Age for workers of the race." Stuart Chase says, "Will it last? I do not know. All I can report is that after ten years it still scorches the face of the curious onlooker." "The Economist" of London, a leading financial journal in the principal capitalist center of the world, bears testimony to the amazing success of the plan as a whole despite its many short comings. Sherwood Eddy, who we have said, knows Russia as few men, says, "While it is to be hoped that its evils may be corrected, with those of other lands as well, economically it is succeeding, and will succeed, in the judgment of a majority of the economic experts, at least of those who are not determined that a workingman's government shall not and must not succeed."

The material handicaps of Russia are great. Her seasons are very short. Her soil is poor. There is a scarcity of rain fall. Natural resources, in many of the basic minerals, are limited. She is not accessible to the trade routes of the world. These are great hindrances to permanent economic progress. But though in a measure at least she may be doomed to failure in realizing a high standard of material living for her people, she is not struggling in vain. The world does not yet know the handicaps that may be overcome by coöperation and planning on a national scale. And though the economic project may measurably fail, she presents to the world a great ideal and a new challenge.

We are now compelled to recognize that here is a new economic program in which great things are

being done. We may not like all that is being done. We may dislike the way they do it. But the above testimonies, and many more that might be given, show that some of the things which are being done are the things we know we should do and are not doing. Can we honestly face the facts that Russia, with her inhuman treatment of the enemies of her program and with her violent method of revolution, is actually giving more justice than our system is giving? She has more racial equality and brotherhood than the Christian nations. She has less unemployment, less crime, less prostitution, and less rottenness in politics than we have. The greatest inequalities in the world exist in our capitalistic Christian nations. One writer says: "Since the inequalities which industrialism is creating in the western world grow daily more vivid and outrageous, only a callous conscience can view this Russian experiment without sympathy. Nothing is more basic to an ethical society than equality of opportunity, and Russia bids fair to establish it more completely than any western nation."

Two great tests will decide the issue of communism in its relation to individualistic systems. One is, which will produce and distribute goods most economically and efficiently? The other issue, which in a large measure grows out of this one, is, which program will produce the greatest human welfare?

The communists of Russia, on a vast national scale, are definitely undertaking to do exactly these

two things. They are honestly and earnestly seeking a system that will provide the greatest good for the greatest number. Their test of every procedure is the social result. Equality for all is their goal; and they are ready to give it to all who will have it. Their class enemies are those who will not accept equality; therefore, they do not get it from the communists. The soviet constitution states their aim as follows: "The abolition of exploitation of men by men, the entire abolition of the division of the people into classes, the suppression of exploiters, the establishment of a socialist society, and the victory of socialism in all lands." One of their official documents says they aim to "Transform the whole world into a coöperative commonwealth and bring about real human brotherhood and freedom." What Christian nation has earnestly undertaken to end all exploitation?

The communists have rejected the religion of Czarist Russia. They have dethroned its God, and sought to destroy all religion; but their passion for a new and better world almost becomes another religion. It is a passionate humanism. They believe in a perfect human society and intend to build it. And they seem capable of great sacrifice for their objective. One wonders if Christians will make as great sacrifice for their creed as communists will for theirs.

Here is a nation bold enough to attempt to build an economic order based on the conviction that there are more powerful motives than private profits. In challenging the motive of private profits

they are driving at the heart of our present system. Their cardinal doctrine is communal sharing. They contend that class divided societies and oft recurring wars and depressions are the result of an individualistic system, which they are convinced encourages the spirit of selfishness and greed.

The likeness of the essential message of communism to that of socialism is evident. Lenin himself, the successful founder of Russian communism, used the two terms interchangeably. In their economic goals they are brothers. Communism is the extreme and militant wing of socialism.

The joker in communism and socialism for our economic order is the doctrine of public ownership and control of property. The supreme issue between the two great economic systems is: Will private ownership stand the test of the determination of the race to have the highest development of all men?

I wish we might go more extensively into the problems of public ownership. Let no one think public ownership would be a panacea for all the ills of our present order. It would be no guarantee against selfishness. Walter Lippmann in his book, "A Preface to Morals," says: "The administration of industry under socialism no less than under capitalism depends upon the character of the administrator. Corrupt, stupid, grasping functionaries will make at least as big a muddle of socialism, as stupid, selfish, and acquisitive employers can

make of capitalism."* We do not have in socialism and communism methods of regenerating the human heart, except as environment is an agent of regeneration. They come more nearly being methods by which to control the actions of unregenerate hearts.

Can personal initiative be developed and maintained without individual cash rewards? The British and American socialists do not aim at equal rewards for all. According to the best authorities on Russia, they allow some difference in incomes. Many judge all forms of socialism by an extreme communism. This is what many magazine writers are doing; and most readers agree with their confusions. In the Russian system there is some difference in monetary rewards; but the large difference consists of social and cultural benefits. There is much less financial reward for the individual under every socialist or communist program. Many of the writers on socialism in Europe and on communism in Russia reveal that they are not destroying the initiative and enthusiasm of the people. The masses of Vienna have a new zeal for life. The peasants of Russia are being challenged as never before; they are discovering themselves. Millions are being captivated with a great national program for promoting the welfare of all and for building a better world. Eddy writes: "The center of gravity has shifted from the individual and the separate home to the community. In play and

* By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

work coöperation becomes a life habit. It is a new way of life. From birth to death their whole training is not to get on in a struggle for individual acquisition and possession, but for the welfare of the whole community. Social acquisition takes the place of individual hoarding. We were impressed by the fact that of all the men with whom we talked who had been in America and tasted what was to them the flesh pots of prosperity and high wages, not one wanted to go back. There was not a man, and very few of the women and children, but preferred what they considered the spiritual values of a greater freedom, self-expression, and self-realization in this coöperative community to the greater personal gain and individual possession that they could have in America." Possibly the motive of social welfare may yet prove more powerful than the motive of private profits. Especially may this be true with the masses, who see little chance for them in the race for profits.

The big problem is not equality of rewards so much as equality of opportunity; and we do not have it in our present system. Our extremes of poverty and wealth are not giving it. Need we pause to cite examples? Consider the sportsman with an income of millions. Compare his child with the child of the slum. Equality of opportunity? Not by ten thousand miles! The question is, would some form of communism or socialism come more nearly giving it?

We need not be so afraid of public ownership. We have our Federal Post Office System, Parcel

Post, and Express. It is objected, these do not pay. Should it not be answered, They do not exist to pay? They exist to serve. If they did pay, we would pay more than we do for our mail service. Schools, libraries, parks, hospitals, municipal water systems, irrigating systems, are other examples of our public ownership. The only question is, How much shall we have? Just where should the line be drawn? Here is where socialists differ with our system. Not that they believe in public ownership and that we do not. All believe in public ownership, and reap great benefits from it. The question is, Where shall we draw the line so as to reap the greatest benefit for the greatest number? If all wanted the greatest benefit for the greatest number it might be easier to know where to draw the line. Much of the opposition to public ownership is backed by a determination for private profits, not human welfare.

Socialists and communists believe in a new society and are seeking to build it. They believe that the chief hindrance to this new society is private possession and control of property. Therefore, they would establish public ownership and control, especially of the agencies of production and distribution. We see the genius of socialism and communism. We see the one big thing at which both are driving—the evils of private control of property.

Because of the injustices and evils of our system our social order is tottering. The two roots of many of these evils are the institution of private

property and the power of individual control. The full fruitage from these roots is now appearing all over the world. And simultaneous with this unwholesome harvest is developing a world phenomenon—the spectacular growth of communism and socialism in nearly every land. And the significant thing is that these developing forms of social organization are seeking to cut the very roots which seem to produce the major evils of our present system. They would effect a radical change in the existing economic organization. Their change probably would not alter the nature of the plant, but would cut the two roots that seem to be responsible for much of the evil fruit. We shall see later that something much more basic needs to be done. But as far as methods of control are concerned, does any system do more? What are we to do with these facts? There is a tremendous challenge here which our economic order, with its tragic results and present serious conditions, must face. We can not dodge it. Basil Matthews says, "No other political and economic gospel in the world is making any challenge comparable with it." Eddy says: "If, after ten thousand years of competitive strife, of endless wars and the scramble for private gain, one vast land could really be socialized and learn the life of coöperative sharing, its possible significance for human life can hardly be imagined."

The reports and findings of many church conferences might here be cited revealing the fact that the informed leaders of the Christian churches are

appreciating the great challenge which socialism and communism are presenting to the nations of the world and to the Christian church. This challenge is vital enough that the nations of the orient are feeling its pull. The trend of events suggests that they may be finding in these forms of social control, systems more congenial to the spirit of the east than our competitive individualism. This challenge is shaking the old foundation stones of every individualistic order in such a measure that, though the present forms of this new appeal may not abide, the ideal they present shall never cease to lure a progressive race.

We recognize many evils in the existing forms of communism and socialism. We see major weaknesses and handicaps in their economic theories and policies. We are in radical disagreement with the communists' method of force and revolution in inaugurating and maintaining their program. But what are we going to do with their essential message? Can we meet the challenge?

Can our present order adjust itself to the great doctrine that the welfare of the many must always come before the profits or property of the few? Will our economic order be able to reorganize its methods and change its major ideals so as to guarantee that private possession of property shall not block the welfare and development of the masses? Can we modify our system of individual control of resources and of the agencies of production so that they are certain to be used for the greatest common good? Can we underwrite the utmost welfare

of the race by the reconstruction of our economy? This is the Challenge of socialism and communism. If our individualistic system can not meet this challenge it can not endure.

CHAPTER IX

WHAT PLAN WILL WIN AND WHEN WILL WE PLAN?

When will America begin to plan her economic life? Our government would not build a state or national capital without a plan. How can we hope to build an economic order without one?

We do have many planning. Many great minds are searching for a solution of our economic ills. Many of the leaders in our present system are earnestly searching for a better plan. I do not want to be misunderstood at this point. Many men of wealth are bemoaning the results of our present plan and desire a better one. Many are planning, but there is little coördination of the many plans. Each does what is right in his own eyes, and that is generally what appears best for his own financial success. It is true that we pass a thousand laws a year to curb the wild actions of men but we can not keep up with their wildness. Legislation is certain to lag behind the ingenuity of greed when the rank and file of money-makers, some of whom are the lawmakers, care little about the total result.

We have many plans for the various fields of industry; we pass many laws to regulate details; but we have no unified and integrated plan for our total economic life. We are like the traditional college professor. We are learned in some things

but very childish in others. Compared with the great efficiency with which we manage many of the departments of our living, the management of our total life is childish. We are doing marvelous things in the technical fields of science and in the many departments of production, but when it comes to the application of the works of genius to the total life of society we act like morons. We have abundance of knowledge but little wisdom. We have everything except integration. We are infantile in the management of our economic life.

We have the ability to redeem our material living. Recall the paradox of our depression—factories, engineers, materials, men, and needs, but the wheels are locked. It is because we have no unified plan. We do not seem to know what the whole thing is for. Instead, a few know what they want it for; but humanity is not involved. We have the ability, the technicians, the administrators, but we refuse to use them. We could have a plan; but Prometheus is bound. The engineers of industry have developed our production to marvelous efficiency. The masters of industry say: "Let there be light"; and there is light; "Let there be a thousand oil wells"; and there are; "Let there be a machine to do the work of five hundred men"; and it is created; "Let there be a hundred story building"; and it rises into the sky. The masters say so and so; and it is so.

Then why can not the masters of industry say: Let there be human welfare, let all be fed and clothed, let all have the opportunity of abundant

living? As we have seen, it could be said. Why isn't it said? Because Prometheus is bound. Why is Prometheus bound? Because the engineers and administrators have received one instruction. One word has been spoken to them. They must obey that word or resign. That one word is profits. Yes, Prometheus is bound. Production is reduced, not because the ability of the producer has reduced, not because human needs have reduced, but because the purchasing power of those in need has reduced.

Prometheus remains bound because those who could unbind him would no longer have a monopoly on the fruits of his wisdom. "The World Tomorrow" says: "Our mechanized civilization has advanced to a point where it cries out for planning and control in the interests of all—a sort of planning and control which can not possibly be executed without encroaching on vested interests and traditional property rights." We execute no plan for the nation because a few have a plan for themselves.

But, if Prometheus is kept bound much longer he may die. The corner on the products of our industrial machine is wrecking the machine. We need no more evidence of the breakdown of our system—scandalous waste and tragic need, overproduction with masses undernourished, billions in banks and millions fearing starvation, an equipped industry with wheels locked. American conditions cry out for the planning of our total economic

program! But there is no answer; the cry is heard, but unheeded.

There are other nations, that, though far below the United States in all the technique of industry, are seeking to plan on a national scale.

India has a ten year plan, which the nationalists propose to put into effect, if they are granted self-government. It calls for a decade of self-denial for the good of the entire nation. The maximum salary for government officials would be sixty dollars per month. They would thus seek to secure public servants who are servants, and not parasites. The heavy military budget would be reduced. They would labor to release India from foreign financial control, and to build an indigenous industrial order sufficient to supply all essential needs of their people.

Russia is planning. Her five year plan has been discussed. Sherwood Eddy says, "Russia is the only country which has the distinction of bringing its whole economy—industry, agriculture, and trade; production, consumption, and distribution, under the preview of a single general staff."* Whether or not we like her plan, she has one; and her people are becoming enthusiastic for it. This plan is already doing wonders for Russia. It will do more.

England is doing more planning on a national scale than America. She has tremendous odds

*From "The Challenge of Russia," copyright, by Sherwood Eddy and reprinted by permission of the publishers, Farrar and Rinehart, Inc.

against which to labor. The terrible results of the old regime almost wreck any program.

Several other nations are surpassing the United States in detailed plans of relief from the evil results of the present order. Seventeen other nations less prosperous than our own have unemployment insurance, to which the worker makes a regular contribution from his wages. We may not like such plans, but the facts are that other nations are earnestly seeking some solution of their ills. Sherwood Eddy, after writing of what the other nations far less able than the United States, are doing, says: "Yet the richest country on earth, in a planless chaos, in a competitive anarchy of private profit, has nothing to offer in these recurring crises but a spasm of 'charity' or artificial and unscientific public works, to meet a fraction of the need of the unknown number of the unemployed. To our disgrace, we do not even know how many are unemployed and have no adequate plan to meet the present crisis, or the periodic cyclical depressions, or the chronic maldistribution of wealth and income."

I wonder if America is entitled to her superiority complex. A few years ago, the editor of one of our popular magazines said: "There is only one first-class civilization in the world today and that is right here in the United States. It may be a cocky thing to say, but relatively it is first-class, while Europe is second-class, and Asia fourth to sixth." It was a cocky thing to say; and multitudes in America are saying the same thing. There

is some truth in it; but before we say too much we had better begin to plan, on a national scale, that part of our life which occupies more of the time and effort of our people than any other, that part of our life that is the corner stone of human welfare, that part, which now, for lack of a plan, is dissolving the security of millions, is darkening the future of all, and threatens to wreck our civilization.

America had better plan. Many a mighty nation has fallen on the rock of unsolved economic and social problems—the problems of injustice and oppression, the problems of luxury and tragic need. The wrecking rock of many nations has been an unplanned economy, which ever produces the extremes that end in revolution. Where are the nations of history? No nation is immune to destruction, not even our own beloved America!

This is a wonderful land and a wonderful civilization. But, in this day of world awakening, with its crying need for world brotherhood, we must have a better world than we now have. We have a good civilization here in America; but we must have a better one. It is good, but not good enough, for "time makes ancient good uncouth." It is not good enough to meet modern demands. The old horse and buggy, the old dirt road, and even the model T Ford, are not good enough to meet modern demands. Likewise, some phases of our present social life, hold-overs from days of differing conditions, are not good enough for our interdependent world. This is especially true of our pres-

ent economic system. Our acquisitive competitive methods, our price and profit system, are no longer good enough to be the corner stones of a world ecnomy. When will we plan an economy to match our day? And what will that plan be?

Some very superficial remedies are being suggested. Each may have some merit as a remedy for a wrecked society. But most of them are palliative rather than preventative.

Some say, Destroy the machine. They would cancel the problems of this modern age by going back to the methods of a former age. Opposition to mechanical invention and the perfecting of all processes is blind and futile. Can we not have social genius to match mechanical genius?

Some say, Unemployment insurance is the solution of the great problems created by the machine. If we can not destroy the machine that creates unemployment then pay those who are unemployed. This is no permanent solution. It is not justice. It is charity. It is no plan for the future. It is relief from the past. I think it may now be necessary and right; the wreck has occurred. But it is no plan.

Others are saying, in order to prevent our periods of depression, we must distribute production. This is the recommendation of an article in a recent Kiwanis magazine. The Proctor and Gamble Company is cited as making commendable progress here. This is worthy and helpful; but it does not go to the heart of the problem.

It is evident that programs of public works for

periods of depression are methods of relief. They prevent the death of the sick body; they do not rehabilitate the entire organism. They are temporary. They get to the heart of nothing. It must be kept in mind that for all of these works somebody must pay; and it is always society that pays.

Staggering jobs is suggested as a solution. This means dividing one man's work and wages among two or three or more. This is a million miles from a solution. It means starvation by inches rather than now. Why does not someone suggest staggering incomes? Instead of distributing the work and wages, how about dividing incomes and profits? Some can offer many suggestions to stabilize business; but they seem to shy away from distribution of incomes. In their extremity, the beneficiaries of the present system are able to invent all sorts of foolish proposals in order to maintain things as they are. We have noted in a former chapter the foolish proposals to limit production and to waste as much as possible. Limit production while needs are unsupplied, and waste as much as possible when millions have less than the waste? This is the insanity of selfishness!

It is not possible for us to design the organs and body of a new society; but I believe we can locate and describe its heart. A writer in a recent issue of the Kiwanis magazine, says: "Let us look at the problem from the long-time point of view so that when business 'turns the corner' there will not be all too soon another runaway and a greater crash." This is exactly what will happen if we

do not go to the heart of the problem. The periodic cycles will repeat themselves as long as the most fundamental of economic laws are outraged.

Our problem is far deeper than method of control. To destroy one form of economic power and control and enthrone another may not touch the heart of the issue. The solution is not to replace capitalism with communism—the power of the capitalist with the power of the proletariat. It is not a relocation of power that we need. We need a new kind of power—a new motive back of power. Our material system of things needs to be born again. The old organism may be good, but it must have a new heart.

I believe that the motive of private profits, and the supreme ideal of goods for self, are the direct cause of our wrecked economy. It is the cause of the mess we are in. Selfishness will some day be placed in the museum of economic lore. It is out of date. It does not work. In time it destroys itself. It commits suicide. Always and necessarily this is true.

Therefore I say, it makes little difference whether the method of our economy is the selfishness of capitalism or the selfishness of any other form of economic control. Roger Babson says: "Capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and all other isms are mere tools. Any one of these systems operated in Jesus' way would be an improvement over present conditions. . . . Any one of these systems without the spirit of Jesus is bound to fail." Society has been blindly following its greedy

desires and then trusting in Providence to overrule the destructive results of that greed. God does not work that way!

I am ready to sum up the burden of all I have said as to remedy, and say, there is none—none that will work—none that will be permanent—that is built on the principle of self-seeking and self-interest. Selfishness will not work. Jesus told us so two thousand years ago, but we do not believe him. We will not believe him! And the history of mankind has told us so two thousand times, but we do not believe it. We will not believe it! We brace ourselves against the fundamental law of life —" Give and it shall be given," " share and live "— and then go on living the opposite, while we trust in God for salvation from the mess which results.

The heart of our economic morality is pagan. There is no hope of national welfare or of world welfare until this economic morality is born again. This is not sentimental religion. It is common sense. It is genuine economics. It is not for the sake of religion that we say this; it is for the sake of the life of society. It is for the sake of any order that we point out the essential weakness of our present order.

What plan will win? Not necessarily one that overthrows capitalism. Dr. Herman F. Swartz, president of the Pacific School of Religion, said to fifteen hundred social and religious leaders of the West, " The control rather than the overthrow of capitalism offers the best promise." One thing sure, this is the easiest road for this generation.

But this is possible providing greed is dethroned! Undoubtedly, regulation of the present system, rather than its overthrow, would be much quicker and safer. But remember, greed must be dethroned! Regulation of a selfish system will not work. In some states, commissions created to control public utilities, are the ones being controlled. Greed must be dethroned! I see no plan that will ever work, until we put men before money—human welfare before profits.

We have said that our civilization is better in many of its phases than in the management of its economic life. I wonder what is the relationship of this to the fact that business is the only phase of our life that is openly professed to be on the profit basis. Education is not. Religion is not. When art and culture are, they immediately become debased. Social life is crass when money creeps in. Commercialized love is prostitution. When the profit motive enters the minds of statesmen and officers, the result is rotten politics. There must be something radically wrong with the profit motive; for now it is wrecking the one phase of our life in which it has been considered essential.

What plan will most completely dethrone greed? What plan will allow the most complete displacement of the profit motive, as the central drive of our economic system? I am convinced that it will have to be displaced. I see no way to control it. "The devil is an ass." What plan will most effectively dethrone greed and nullify the profit motive? "The World Tomorrow" says, "Individual-

istic capitalism is doomed, as certainly as feudalism was doomed. It may live a long time; but it must die." But note that they say individualistic capitalism. It must die because it is individualistic, not because it is capitalistic. Feudalism died because it was individualistic. If capitalism can change and become social, it may yet survive.

We may be headed for a modified socialism. At least, we are rapidly coming to the conviction that property must serve man—all men, not a few men. Dr. Harry F. Ward writes: "The trend of change in the institution of property is very evident. It is toward the increase of common ownership through various forms of voluntary association; in lesser degree, but still in marked manner, it is toward more public ownership through the agencies of government. This development is proceeding farther and faster than most people recognize." *

When we begin to talk about more public ownership for the good of all, some immediately cry, "Socialism!" and thenceforth only the emotions are able to function. The rational processes immediately cease. That one word is a certain anæsthetic to many minds.

Why must we be so afraid of public ownership? Why is our press so insistent that the government must keep out of business? Dr. Ward says: "The press and politicians, most of them, continue to shout the virtues and glories of freedom in money-making. With almost united voice they tell us

* From "Our Economic Morality." By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

that the government must keep out of business, despite the fact that wherever it can help business to make money they demand its aid, in tariff, the granting of ship subsidies, the supplying of scientific knowledge through research and educational institutions supported by public funds."* The facts seem to be that it is very difficult for people to think straight on any question where their pocketbooks are involved. Many are radically opposed to any semblance of socialism, though it may lead to more justice for all, because, and only because, they have too many privileges in the present system. There is no religion in dodging issues, even if selfishness is back of it!

Can we hide our own privileges in the present order of things, put ourselves in the shoes of all men, and think through this question? It is an heroic thing to do.

The plan which serves all men best, will win! Two things that this will mean, are coöperation instead of competition, and sharing of control and profits.

Coöperation and sharing, work in individual industries. Mr. Hapgood of Indianapolis is proving it. Mr. Hapgood is no church member because he thinks he has not found a church that takes Jesus seriously in the matter of economic justice. Mr. Nash of Cincinnati proved that coöperation and sharing of profits work. Certainly they work, if they are tried. Many others have proved it. The

* From "Our Economic Morality." By permission of the Macmillan Company, publishers.

many developments along these lines provide a foundation for optimism.

Then when we consider the possibilities of coöperation and sharing on a national scale between all industries and all the complex phases of our entire economic order, we are scarcely able to realize what benefits would come to man. Think of all scientists, engineers, and managers coöperating to serve all the people! Think of all industries, ceasing competition, cancelling all the expenses and liabilities involved in a competitive system, and coöperating in serving society as efficiently and as economically as possible! Think of all factories and equipment, all engineers and managers, all the natural resources of the world, all capital, and all workmen being used in one vast program of coöperation to make everything every man needs! Think this over, not being too sure that competition is the life of trade, and not being too certain that man will work for nothing but the dollar. The present results from systems of coöperation in Europe and in Russia are a revelation of the possibilities of mutual control on a national scale.

Can not we imagine that coöperation and sharing might possibly work in our economic life, since it is the only thing that will work in family life, in the educational program, in the church, in community relations, and, though not yet generally recognized, in international relations? We are not able to conceive what coöperation and sharing, universally practiced, might do for the economic life of the world.

I am writing a big question mark over the old economic doctrine that competition is the life of trade. I believe its advocacy today is the rationalization of selfish hearts. It is the best spur, if the profit-motive and self-interest are to stand unquestioned. But I believe the history of American life gives abundant evidence of a great conflict between competition and the welfare of all, as it gives evidence of the great conflict between the motive of private profits and public good. Kirby Page says, "Bitterness and strife are inherent in a system that rests upon self-interest, competition, and profits." He further says, "Modern industrial communities are more of a battlefield than they are a brotherhood." We have an average of 25,000 commercial failures in this country every year; and thousands more scarcely escape bankruptcy. This is tragic to character and the sweetness of human relations. The motive of private profits, the spirit of self-seeking, and the method of competition are not only being questioned; they stand condemned by the wrecked remains of many civilizations built upon them. And they stand condemned by the tragic results of our own competitive and selfish system.

So to answer the question of the hour, What plan will win? our first answer is a negative one. Our present plan, the heart of which is competition for private profits—the method and goal of selfishness—can never win. But what plan will win? What is the positive answer? As to the details of the plan that will win, I can not say. It would be

presumption and folly for me to enter the field of technique in economic procedure. These problems must be worked out by thousands of business and social experts through decades of time. I will not attempt to suggest the major outlines of the future society. We can not apply a name, such as capitalistic, socialistic, communistic. It will make little difference what its label may be. There is no panacea for a perfect world. All existing systems are on trial.

I am seeking to say only one thing about it. The heart of the plan that will win, instead of competition for private profits, must be coöperation for mutual welfare. Competition will have to be discarded in favor of coöperation. Individualism must give place to mutualism. In the winning plan the method and goal of selfishness will surrender to the method and goal of love. I believe it is impossible for any other plan to win. Mutual welfare must become the passionate objective of business and industry. This must be the major motive—the chief ideal. It must be the central drive. There is no redemption for business until this transformation is wrought. More periods of prosperity may possibly come, but the valleys will also come; and some time the cycle will not repeat.

And I am convinced that when society is ready to pay the price of this future plan, it will, by reasonable effort, be able to find the details of the plan. When half the effort of muscle, mind, and money that is now being put into the plans of competitive selfishness, is put into the plan of co-

operation for mutual welfare, it will work. Where there is a will there is a way, except for the way of selfishness when tried too long. And we are trying it too long.

Dr. Robert E. Speer says, "The law of gain must yield to the law of use—selfishness, to service. The principle of competition must be displaced by coöperation." And Worth M. Tippy says, "Business must be looked upon less and less as a personal adventure, and more and more as a great social project." Business must make the man!

"Men lack vision unless they see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making
That does not make the man.
Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world,
Unless the builder grows."

No plan will win that does not make the man! Salvador De Madriaga said recently: "The pride of a nation should be in the number and quality of the choice individuals she produces; in her capacity for evolving such an environment that human beings should blossom out in her midst as flowers in a well-kept garden."

Our national capital must be considered a pool of wealth created by joint effort. We must, therefore, consider it subject to the common need, and use it to supply all men with what they should and can have. We must use the nation's resources to supply the nation's needs.

And we are seeing now that we must have not only a nation coöperating to supply the nation's needs; coöperation must extend throughout the world. America has been using the world for America. We now control about one-half of the wealth of the world; and vast amounts of this is in other lands. And so the world is harnessed to our load. The needy world is helping to build our super-civilization. One of the principal banks of the United States announces in a recent annual report that its East Indian Branch made in that year one hundred per cent profit. Here lies the road to trouble. Here lies the path to war. And war is the wrecking of every system of economic living. Since the organization of the Commission on Disarmament at the League of Nations, the four great powers have increased their expenditure for war by $500,000,000 a year. The world is now spending five billion dollars a year on war—competition instead of coöperation, on an international scale; and it is ninety-five per cent competition for profits. This plays no small part in world depression. War can wreck the world. It has wrecked it!

We must have a coöperating world. I do not see how we will ever solve the problems of economic life, even within any one nation, until we believe and act as if the universe was made for all men, not for a few men of a chosen nation. There is no chosen nation, unless some are chosen to bear the burdens of the weaker nations. America was not chosen for luxury and power; she was

self-appointed. We are beginning to realize how impossible it is for America to remain prosperous while the world is prostrate. It is henceforth an impossibility. The days of successful economic nationalism are just now ended! Here is the difference between this and all former depressions. The world has become one; and as a result, the nations must rise into wholesome life together, or go down together. In the program of human welfare, any group or race or nation that is omitted will some day upset the program. The neglected minority or majority will ultimately wreck every unequal system.

In the evolution of a progressive world, it has now become a necessity that the world be organized to serve the world. With a world organized to feed the world, none need be hungry. With a world organized to clothe the world, none need be cold. With a world organized to educate the world, all can have refinement and culture. With a world organized to provide the abundant life for the world, all can have it!

We can stretch our imagination to the utmost and not be able to conceive the possibilities of a world organized to serve the world—the world and every person in it, ready to coöperate and ready to share, that all men everywhere, may have life, and have it abundantly.

There is no other plan!

No plan is worth the making
That does not make the man.

CHAPTER X

THE SIMPLE LIFE IN A NEEDY WORLD

We have been trying to go to the heart of things. But we not only want to go to the heart of things, we want to go on through, and see what all this means to us.

We have said there is no religion in dodging issues. We have tried to dodge none. We will do no dodging now. We will not do as some in the days of slavery, who believed in the brotherhood of man and at the same time believed in slavery. They believed in a great principle, but not in its evident application. As George Eliot wrote, "There are some people whose celestial intimacies do not improve their daily manners." Evident applications of important social doctrines are not always applied.

Some damning things go on in this needy world. As one studies history and modern life and sees the debauching poverty of the multitudes, along side the demoralizing luxury of the few, he is compelled again and again to ask the question, what is right in a needy world?

All have read about the extremes of Roman society in the days before her fall. I read from "Beacon Lights of History": "Cicero and Pompey one day surprised Lucullus at one of his ordinary

banquets, when he expected no guests, and even that cost him about four thousand dollars. His table couches were of purple, and his vessels glittered with jewels. The halls of Heliogabalus were hung with cloth of gold; his couches were of massive silver, and his mattresses, covered with carpets of cloth of gold, were stuffed with down found only under the wings of partridges. . . . Enormous prices were paid for carp, the favorite dish of the Romans as of the Chinese. Drusillus, a former freedman of Claudius, caused a dish to be made of five hundred pound weight of silver. Vitellius had one made of such prodigious size that he was obliged to build a furnace on purpose for it; and at the feast which he gave in honor of this dish, it was filled with the livers of the scarrus (fish), the brains of peacocks, the tongues of parrots, and the roes of lampreys caught in the Carpathian Sea. The nobles squandered money equally on their banquets, their stables, and their dress; and it was to their crimes, says Juvenal, that they were indebted for their gardens, their palaces, their tables, and their fine old plate. Unbounded pride, insolence, inhumanity, selfishness, and scorn marked their noble class." Things like this brought the downfall of Rome.

But how far do we come from matching it? In his challenging book, "Religion and Social Justice," Sherwood Eddy writes: "Recently in this country seven million dollars was spent on a mansion with one hundred twenty-one rooms for one family. A larger amount was spent for a winter resi-

dence in Florida by an absentee citizen; six hundred thousand dollars was spent for a diamond necklace; twenty thousand dollars for a hat; one thousand dollars for a hatpin; seventy-five thousand dollars for opera glasses; thirty thousand dollars for an automobile. Recently three hundred thirty Italian cars have been imported at a cost of sixteen thousand dollars each. We puffed away ninety billion cigarettes last year and nearly two billion dollars in tobacco smoke. One earnest Christian man has just spent five hundred thousand dollars for a playhouse for his six children.

"The most characteristic example of American luxury may be found in the record of expenditures on Park Avenue, New York, as estimated and officially stated by H. Gordon Duval, President of the Park Avenue Association. The four thousand families who live on this avenue between Thirty-fourth Street and Ninety-sixth Street spend a total of two hundred eighty million dollars or seventy thousand dollars per family during the year. They spend for women's clothing fifty million dollars a year, or one hundred ninety-two thousand dollars a day; for liquor, according to the reporter, fifteen million dollars. They spend twenty-six thousand nine hundred twenty-two dollars a day for yachts, eleven thousand five hundred thirty-eight dollars a day for flowers. A father spends twenty-five thousand dollars a year for a single debutante daughter. The women and girls in this section on an average each spend yearly six thousand two hundred fifty dollars for clothing, two thousand dollars for furs,

five hundred dollars each in beauty shops, nine hundred dollars for hats. The paltry five millions that these four thousand families give to "charity" is only one-tenth of what the women spend on clothing alone. And a large proportion of these people are professing Christians."*

In all of our cities, we see the extremes of luxury —palaces for homes, spacious lawns, luxurious cars, young people bored by idleness and luxury— all in a needy world. Thousands in America today are living in the ennui of luxury, while millions starve for bread.

Yes, it has always been done; and it is being done. But make no mistake about it—here arise the flames of revolution. The world will stand it only so long. If some get too far from the simple life, a needy world will bring them back to it. Extremes can little longer be contemporaries. Many a civilization has gone down in destruction because of such extremes. We have read of Rome. Roman society fell on this rock of extremes. We have discussed the revolutions of France and of Russia. Their cause is here. No nation can stand on inequality. It has never been done with success. It will never, for long, be done again.

These lessons of history compel us to face some very practical questions. We must face them if we would mix our "celestial intimacies" with our "daily manners."

What may I do in a needy world, and not be

* By permission of Richard R. Smith, publisher.

digging at the foundation of society? What about a million dollar playhouse for a few children, while millions are without the chance to play any wholesome game in safe and decent environments? What about a five thousand dollar playhouse for a few, when many times more have no one thousand dollar home? How about a ten thousand dollar garage for a shining car, when thousands of beaming little faces would love to look out from its doors? I have driven down the boulevards of St. Louis and St. Paul, of Lincoln and Los Angeles, of Des Moines and Dayton, of Cleveland and Chicago. When I can I endeavor to see the fine homes of the cities I visit. I love their beauty. I could linger in the gardens of the world. But when I see in these luxurious suburbs hundreds of garages that would be palaces to many a boy and girl, I am made to wonder.

I have referred to our experience in driving for hours through the finest suburbs of Chicago. One must drive for hours, and down many different streets, to gain an appreciation of the multitudes of families living in luxury. Many a toy these families own would give an undernourished child splendid care for a year, or send an ambitious young man to college. We saw toys and play facilities for an only child that would equip a city playground for several hundred.

The next day we drove through the slum sections of Chicago. We drove down Maxwell and Halsted Streets. We were through the Ghetto, China Town, and the Stock Yard territory. We

went down dozens of side streets and saw again the cursing conditions of the slums. I have seen the slums of many cities. I do not enjoy them, but I have seen them. Any one who will go on these two trips with me—through the fine suburbs of one of the largest cities of the world, and through the slums of that same city—and will go with open eyes and open mind, will be certain to do some serious thinking.

Seeing these tragic extremes, I would not be human if I were not led to wonder! A luxurious life in a needy world! I wonder! Hundreds with incomes of a million and more—in a needy world! Thousands with incomes of one hundred thousand and more—in a needy world! A million with incomes of five thousand and above—in a needy world! I wonder!

Kirby Page says: "In several million American homes the total income is utterly inadequate to provide the necessities and decencies of life. The result is malnutrition and disease from lack of proper food; wretched housing conditions with the consequent lack of privacy and attractiveness, leading to immorality and domestic discord; mental and cultural destitution; inadequate recreational facilities; and the increase of crime as a result of all these factors. And yet we find in the same communities a small percentage of persons who live in extreme luxury, gratifying every physical desire, spending enough on some new toy to remove a neighboring family from desolation, and wasting on superfluities sufficient to provide the

physical basis for the good life in a hundred households. Many Christians see no contradiction between their own luxurious living and the example of their Lord."

When will we seek the solution of our problems by going to the root of them? Crime is very largely the result of these conditions. We do not see how largely because we do not know the conditions of our society. How about one family spending enough on some passing whim to remove a neighboring family from destitution? What is the total result of one person wasting on superfluities sufficient to provide the physical basis for the good life in a hundred households? I repeat, here lies the cause of our restless order. Here lies the road to revolution. We do not see through the eyes of others. We do not feel with the hearts of others. We do not use the eyes and the hearts of the needy, the destitute, and the underprivileged.

We could ask some very searching questions here. How about a standard in a certain stratum of our society which requires twenty-five hundred dollars to clothe a gentleman? One American woman paid three thousand dollars duty on dresses which she brought from Paris. How about five hundred dollars for a fur, when children in the same city shiver with cold? How far is it from paganism, when, in a needy world, ladies spend several thousand dollars on their yearly attire? We have seen enough of the injustices of our society to allow us to entertain such questions.

Would it be out of place to quote some scriptures

concerning these practices? "I desire that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment" (1 Tim. 2: 9). "Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel" (1 Peter 3: 3). We have forgotten many parts of the Bible. Many Christians are strong for the Bible! Strong for the Bible? Yes, strong for the parts that suit them. Twenty-five dollars for a dress to be used for a dozen occasions! Eleven dollars and fifty cents for a hat to wear for three months; then, regardless of how much it is worn, to be discarded because it is out of style! Is the ability to follow all the styles a license to do so?

I want to write one big question mark in our minds and in our consciences: Do we have a right to have all we can have in a needy world? "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Any church member who is not doing it —who is not bearing and sharing the burdens of every man in need—is not fulfilling the law of Christ. Can we let this scripture test our actions?

Why can not we be so much as human on the question? Any one who would let his father or mother, his sister or brother, go in the misery and handicap of poverty, while he reveled in luxury, would be socially ostracised. We all agree that there would be nothing brotherly or human about such actions. We would not treat our brother so!

But who is our brother? If we take Jesus' word for it, he is anyone in need. And why not? What

have location, color, and circumstance to do with brotherhood? Where is our love? Where is our compassion? Where is our kindness, sympathy, and spirit of service? Where is our religion? I think the world is a long way from the religion of Jesus! The Christian world is a long way from him. We do not know our Lord.

We expect a person, when in the presence of need, to seek to supply that need. We expect a teacher to save her own pupils from fire or storm. We expect a chauffeur or engineer to protect, if possible, his passengers, even if he perish in the attempt. We expect a friend to save another from drowning, even at the risk of his own life. If our friend or brother is present, and in need, our social ethics call for response to that need.

But are friendship and brotherhood limited by race and geography? An African watched another African drown. When he was asked why he didn't try to help him, he replied, "He is not from my tribe." That is the act of a pagan! Yes, and that is the act of a million Christians! As long as we allow distance and color to affect our appreciation of, and response to, the needs of men all over the world, we are not far from paganism!

In a Practice Preaching Class under Dr. Norman E. Richardson, a young man from Nebraska related the experience of his family during several years of failing crops. Finally one fall, after another failing crop, they knew not what to do. They were too poor to move. They decided they would try to exist through the winter. Time went on,

and food was used until nothing was left but potatoes and water. One morning toward the close of the winter, each had his portion of potatoes and water except mother; she did not eat. Again at noon, the children had their portion, but mother did not eat; she said she was not hungry. At supper the mother did not eat; but the children had their portion. At breakfast the next morning mother was weak, but she did not eat. During the day mother was scarcely able to do her work. She was denying herself the privilege of eating that her children might have their regular portion. She saved others, herself she would not save. This she did because she loved her own. Such is the measure of a mother's love.

What is the measure of a Christian's love? Is the Spirit of Christ limited to ties of flesh and blood? Does a mother's love exceed the love of Christ? Jesus says, "Ye are my disciples if ye love one another." Will ties of flesh go farther than ties of spirit? Will the desires of the flesh go farther for their satisfaction than love will go for its expression? Distance in our modern world is nullified for the supplying of our wants. We go to the ends of the earth to satisfy our wishes and whims. We go to the ends of the earth to supply our own needs. How about going to the ends of the earth to supply the needs of others? The whole world is in our presence, by means of money and transportation, for the supplying of our comforts and luxuries. Should not the whole world be in our presence, by the same means, for the supplying

of the needs of others? And especially, should not this be true when these others are the ones who help to supply our luxuries? Will the craze for luxuries for self go farther than the passion of love for others?

We heard recently over the radio of a child in Chicago who was inefficient in school. When inquiry was made as to the cause of his inefficiency, he said, "It was not my turn for breakfast." They inquired further, and found there were five in the family, and that they were taking turns at eating breakfast. This boy had no nickel to buy milk at school. The teachers of his school arranged for him to have his milk. He then did better in his work. There are thousands like him in Chicago. And there are hundreds of families in the same city living in extreme luxury! What about luxurious living in a needy world?

Can we be as thorough-going in our heart-searching and life-searching as was Jesus? Let us ask some more questions. And I am not going to answer them. I am not sure of the answer in every case. You will not be. But let us ask them.

Most of the churches are facing large mission deficits. This means that mission work tragically needing to be done is not done. Because of this lack of funds men without Christ never find him. At the same time many followers of Christ here in America, meeting in our churches to study about the needs of these people—hoping to keep alive in their churches the missionary spirit of Jesus—are spending several dollars at these same meetings

for afternoon lunches, while many of them are trying to reduce.

Children in Chicago and in many other cities go undernourished, and lose out in the realization of a big life, because they have no lunch and no nickel to buy milk, while many fellow-students must have their coca cola or candy bar besides three square meals a day.

Members of service clubs must have their cigars and cigarettes on top of a dollar dinner, while some speaker emphasizes the great needs of the underprivileged child. Banquets in our large cities, held in behalf of brotherhood and world welfare, cost from two to six dollars per plate.

Christians celebrate the birthday of their Lord by a week of feasting that gives the doctors overwork for weeks after. What would be a Christian Christmas? Most churches in America celebrate the resurrection of their Lord with a dress parade the expenses of which would tell, for the first time, the Easter story to hundreds, or provide the equipment for abundant living in many lives. What would be a Christian Easter in a needy world? In other words, what would be a Christian Easter in our present world?

May we enter into the sanctuary with these questions? There is the problem of expensive church architecture. I admire the wonderful architecture of the fine new churches of America. I have been in some of the finest, and I love them. They help me to worship. And yet, I wonder! I wonder what that One would say, who told the

story of the good Samaritan, and of the priest who was so intent on his worship that he passed by on the other side—on the other side of human need. Would he wonder about a million dollar church in a needy world? Would he who came not to be ministered unto, nor even to minister unto himself, build a palace for the worship of his own group, while many have no minister and no teacher? How many Protestant churches build below their limit and use the surplus to build churches in sections too poor to provide a decent chapel?

Would we rather leave these questions unasked? But remember, these things are blackening the name of the church until the masses see little light in it. The existence of these things in Christendom stirs the minds of the underprivileged: and the roots of revolution feed on the injustices of the followers of Jesus.

The great question the world must now face is, Shall some have cake before all have bread? In our interdependent world, when we have things we do not need, others will need things they can not have. And as long as our system of production and distribution is as poorly managed as it is, if we have things we do not have to have, others will be without some things they tragically need.

We probably should not go too far here. We want to be efficient. But do we know the difference between the agencies of efficiency and the luxuries of pampered living? We get started in a luxury program and more calls for more. As Franklin said, "When you have one fine thing, you

must buy ten more, that your appearance may be all of one piece." Probably we need to remember poor Dick's answer, "'Tis easier to suppress the first desire than to satisfy all that follow it." Kirby Page says, "Countless thousands of present-day Christians are wearing themselves out in the frantic struggle to keep up with the Joneses." "The desire for things is insatiable and therefore more and more money is demanded. When an income of $5,000 once seemed ample, now $10,000 is absolutely necessary. Do we not hear of the poor rich man with a mere $100,000 when his minimum needs run to twice that amount?" When people get used to a thing, it is justified in their thinking. This is true in conduct as well as in theology. Familiarity sanctifies. We think nothing about some things that are impossible luxuries to many.

Shall some have cake—abundance of cake—too much cake—cake until they are cursed by it—while millions lack bread? "The Simple Life in a Needy World!" Is there any sense in such a doctrine? Is there any justice in it? Is there any love? The rub comes when it is discovered that for the many to have more the few must have less—much less. This is too hard a road for many who have become used to luxury and power. Is it too hard a road for the Christian?

I heard a salesman argue that no one ever gives up what he really wants for himself, to share with others. Probably not. But many thousands have seen to it that they want the welfare of a needy world more than luxuries for themselves. I accept

no such slander of the human heart which has been touched by divine love. Certainly, selfish hearts that need not will not live the simple life in a needy world. But there are other hearts. There are hearts that are acquainted with Jesus.

We have the testimony of the great missionary program throughout the centuries that many who are acquainted with Jesus will live the simple life in a needy world. We can not name the thousands —like St. Francis and St. Paul, Carey and Judson, Morrison, Livingstone, Gordon, Brainerd, Zwemer, Jones, and many more—who chose and rejoiced to live the simple life in a needy world.

The Christian spirit rejoices in the simple life. It is the satisfying way to live in a needy world; for if we let material luxuries become necessities in such a world, spiritual necessities are certain to be impossible luxuries. Why? Because the demand for luxuries in a needy world proves a selfish heart. Spiritual riches can not belong to the selfish life! Life is narrow and shallow and mean when its major passions are in behalf of self. The life of society grows warlike when its people compete for things. Jesus must have been right when he said, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." The struggle dispossesseth the heart and the world. Bertrand Russell reminds us, "That the creative desires unite men while the possessive instincts divide them, that the more acquisitive a society becomes, the more it must disintegrate." The more society seeks things the more divided her life must be, for

there is a limit to things. Abundance of things for me spells poverty of things for you. And these unequal conditions mean ill will or distance in both our hearts. Competition for the possession of things means spiritual poverty for all.

But there is no limit to spiritual values. Competition does not divide these; it doubles. The more I have, the more you can have. The more I love you, the more love you will have for me. The more kindness, sympathy, and goodness anyone possesses, the more of these all can have. This is true of truth, beauty, righteousness, love, and the thousand graces of the inner man.

Some big soul has written these lovely lines: "You have asked me to do a good deed to help you, and I will. In return, I ask you to prove your gratitude by keeping alive my good deed. Pledge me you will not let it die. When the 'other fellow' needs help, think of this day and help him if you can: so will my good deed continue to live in yours. And if you bind him to help others too, and he binds them and so on, then, if they keep their pledge, neither my good deed, nor yours, nor his, nor theirs will ever die. Ten thousand years hereafter, perhaps, our simple deeds of kindness still will be active in the earth, passing from heart to heart of men and women who will never have heard of us, but who will be heartened and comforted because today I tried to help you."

The life that seeks goodness multiplies it. The life that seeks the welfare of others is therefore unifying. It binds society together in oneness of

noble living—in the mutual realization of the supreme values of our world. The simple life in a needy world shares the material goods with that needy world, and multiplies the greater values for all.

The simple life is the redeeming life for a needy world. And many great souls know it; and are choosing to live it. Yes, many are choosing—deliberately choosing—when they could have more. Many today are matching the sacrifice of Moses, Jeremiah, and Isaiah, of Christ, Paul, and St. Francis, of Livingstone, Brainerd, and Morrison—by choosing to live the simple life in a needy world.

I think of Sherwood Eddy, with his million dollar estate, deliberately limiting the family budget to $2,000, moving into a more modest section of the city—choosing to live the simple life, that some of the needs of a needy world may be supplied. I think of Harry Emerson Fosdick, who refuses to receive more than a certain salary, when he might have more, because he feels he has all he deserves in a world of need. The preachers themselves, and many more professional men, may yet have to share in bearing the burdens of a bitter day, that all may be helped through the night into the dawn of a better day.

In a recent issue of "The Reformed Church Messenger," and quoted by "The Literary Digest," is an account of the practice of the Mayo brothers of Rochester, Minnesota. They are devoting their surplus funds to educating worthy young doctors. Dr. William Mayo says: "From 1894 onward we

have never used more than half of our incomes on ourselves and our families; latterly, much less. My brother and I have both put ourselves on salaries. We live within them. The very roof of my house goes out of the possession of my family when I die. It is already turned over to the Foundation. I would not want my children deprived the fun and the benefit of wanting something and going out and fighting to get it. And I think, from the rich men with whom I have talked, that this idea has penetrated far more deeply into American life than many imagine." It certainly needs to, for we are here, near the basic and most Christlike way of solving the world's biggest problems!

I am led to think of Gandhi—that great unselfish soul—the most Christian non-Christian in the world—that sincerest of all socialists—one of the greatest of all living men. He is burying himself for his needy people. He is dying to all that many church members hold dear, in order that millions may live for what Christ held dear. Gandhi is searching the heart of Christendom as is no other living man. "He is no alien fanatic new to western ways," says an editorial in the "Boston Globe." "He descended from a line of prime ministers in his native state. Before he abjured worldly gain, he was earning $10,000 a year as an attorney in British courts. The loin cloth is his armor. It is not shining but there is something else shining. It is the spirit of Gandhi." The spirit of this Indian shines brightly, revealing again after two thousand years, and illuminating, the supreme way to build

a better world. He has become poor that others may be rich. He dies that they may live.

These and ten thousand more are choosing to live the simple, but abundant life, in a needy world, that the needy of this needy world may live the abundant life in a Christian world.

A little girl came down the street through slush and mud carrying a little boy on her back. He was almost as big as she. "Well," said a stranger, "you've got a pretty big load haven't you?" "No," said the girl "he's my brother." There will be no burden or sacrifice in simple living when we see that by our simple living we carry a brother into wholesome and abundant life!

CHAPTER XI

THE MESSAGE OF JESUS IN A TOTTERING WORLD

What is the message of Jesus? "The son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister." "I am come that ye may have life and have it abundantly." "He that saveth his life shall lose it; but he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant." "Love one another, even as I have loved you." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one for another." The principal demand that Jesus made of his first disciples was, "Follow me," and he gave them something to follow. He went about doing good. His entire life was one of ministrations. Others were more important to him than his own welfare. His own life was of no account except as it helped to make the lives of others of much account. The deeds of Jesus are the best clue to the heart of his message and of his religion. His is a religion of deeds.

A monk was asked to define Christianity while standing on one foot. In other words, he was to define it as briefly as possible. His answer was, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Jesus made two great statements which come very near summing up his entire message to the world.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength and thy neighbor as thyself." "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so, do ye also unto them." These two great sayings are the heart of the message of Jesus. They are the essence of his religion. He himself says they are. All of his other teachings are expositions of these. All his deeds and the events of his life are the practice and fulfillment of these two great commandments.

If, with our entire being, we love the spirit and way of goodness and love, which we call God; if we love our neighbors as genuinely, as consistently, and as continuously as we love ourselves; if we do unto all men everywhere everything we would want them to do unto us, then Jesus would require no more. The supreme orthodoxy with him is the orthodoxy of deeds.

The objective of Jesus was to help all men unto abundant living. His passion was for human welfare. His method was service. Christianity, according to its Founder, is, first of all and last of all, a way of life. Its motive is love. Its goal is brotherhood. The three great words which I believe Jesus speaks to our world—our present tottering world—are service, coöperation, and struggle for the life of others. He would speak these particular words because they are the essence of the message he was always speaking, and because they are the particular words our present world needs. This is the message of Jesus.

This message of Jesus is the law of life. It is

the law of life for every individual, group, organization, and nation. It is the redemption of every relationship. It is the law of life, not because Jesus stated it; Jesus stated it because it is esentially and eternally the condition of living. He did not originate it. It is as old as God. Jesus saw it more clearly than his predecessors, and stated it in the living terms of deeds.

"And so the Word had breath, and wrought
With human hands, the creed of creeds
In loveliness of perfect deeds,
More strong than all poetic thought."

Jesus spoke this law in the eternal terms of character.

Love is the only law of life. It is the one way of living that results in valuable and continued existence. Henry Drummond suggests that the lower kingdoms of life live by love. The seed is the fruit of the sharing act of the plant; and by this fruit another plant may live. When animal life appropriates that fruit for its own food it is living on the product of love. All life is sustained by the eternal sacrifice of other life. A bee will give its life to protect the hive. An attacked zebra will let the others go on to safety and fight the battle alone rather than endanger the herd. Animals have learned to coöperate and sacrifice for the good of the hive or herd. Animals that learn this lesson perpetuate their species. We believe in the survival of the fittest; but probably the fittest are those who love the most and coöperate the best.

This law of life holds in every realm. Drummond is correct when he says that the best things in the world's life have come to us through the struggle for the life of others. The evolution of the race is very largely the result of struggle for the welfare of all. The finest things of every civilization are the result of living the law of love. Need we cite the progress of peoples made possible by the sacrificial labors of missionaries? Need we note the great achievements in science and education which have been the fruit of heroic altruism? The benefactors of the race have obeyed the law of life. The smile on the face of civilization is the fruit of the world's servants who have lived for others. Someone asked what it would take to build a certain institution. The answer was, "Somebody's life blood." It is true of every institution, every movement, every noble cause. Everything of value costs life and love. It is the condition of progress. Every step forward and upward in the life of the race has been through the tired muscles, the tears, and the longings of hearts that love. The Utopia, the kingdom of God, the better world for the home of man, is found up the incline route of struggle and sacrifice for the welfare of others, and of coöperation in that struggle.

"So make we all one company,
Life's golden cord our tether,
And come what may, we'll climb the way
Together—aye together!"

There is no way up for the race but for individuals to go down; but he who will go down for the

good of all will come up into abundant life with a better world. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit." Jesus spoke the sine qua non of progress for the individual and for the race when he said: "He that saveth his life shall lose it; but he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." He that forgets himself in heroic efforts for the good of his fellow-men, lives the supremely worth while life. He lives in the sweet and spiritual relations of love, friendship, goodwill, and mutual realization of the eternal values. Love is the law of life. Kagawa is correct: "Love alone gives cohesiveness to society." "Love rejuvenates society. With love then, let us effect our reorganization. With love let us purify. Love is the eternal revolutionist." Love is the only force that can rebuild the world. Love is the only power that can redeem a life. It is the one law of successful living.

By this law every thought and deed of every life is tested. By it every organization and institution is tested. The value of every relationship is measured by it. This law is written into the nature of things. Paul is necessarily correct when he advises that "all things be done in love." They must be done in love or die. Coöperation, service, and struggle for the life of others is the message of Jesus for our world. It is the message of Jesus because it is written into the nature of all existence, and because every other way is the way of death.

Struggle for self is the way of self-destruction.

When men are mastered by a selfish motive for the material goods of life, they miss the best life holds for them. In forgetting the culture of the mind they die unto the world of truth. In failing to take time for the development of social relations they die unto the world of friendship. In neglecting the more spiritual functions of the self they travel the road of death for the inner man. The selfish heart is dead.

It is true of nations. When nations compete for the resources of the earth, the result is international competition, ill will, and war. And in modern warfare, millions are killed outright and entire nations die unto love and appreciation for the good in other nations and peoples. The casualties of war are not all on the battlefield. The greatest losses are not there. Every war murders the best things in the lives of millions of people. Neither the bodies of men nor the spirits of men can follow the way of selfishness and live. The fittest survive, but the fittest are those who learn to coöperate, sacrifice, and struggle for the development of all men. War is the supreme example of the opposite of this way. It is the most complete practice of the law of death. Therefore, war wrecks the world. Ill will and hatred and all the other attitudes of selfishness are the most wasteful things in the universe. If they were not checked by the powers of love they would destroy the race. They are the negation of the law of life.

Selfishness is suicide! When the young and growing tree of selfishness is developing it appears

very promising. Its foliage is beautiful to the grower. Its shade entrances his senses. He becomes enamoured with the promising benefits of this tree. The appearance of the fruit is pleasing to the eye. But when the fruit is fully ripened, and the grower eats it, he is poisoned, and dies. It is the fruit of death. He that saveth his life must lose it! In every relationship Christ's law of giving and sharing is the condition of continued existence. It is the central law of the universe. It is at the center of the nature of things. It is the center. It is the track on which the world was made to run. If the world gets off this track, it sinks in the mire and quicksands of selfishness. It keeps on sinking until it goes under.

Love is the light of life and the fuel of existence. Without it civilizations enter the tombs of time. Without it our lamps go out, and we falter and stumble in a dark world.

"The night has a thousand eyes
And the day but one,
Yet the light of a bright world dies
With the dying sun.

"The mind has a thousand eyes
And the heart but one,
Yet the light of a whole life dies
When its love is done."

There is no evasion. We can not dodge this law of love. There is no substitution. All substitutes are counterfeits. In the bank of the nature of things they will not pass. They are "no good" in the rigid requirements of an interdependent

world. There are no exemptions from the law of life. There is no place in the universe where it does not hold. It is like the law of gravity on the earth. We must live in harmony with it or get many bumps. If we continue to engage in major violations we get bumped out of existence. Gravity is written into the nature of physical existence, and love is written into the nature of social existence. It is the inviolable condition of worth while living in a social world. As the auto was made to run on gasoline, man was made to run on love. If we try selfishness, the motor of life sputters, backfires, and dies. The world, and all of life, were originally planned for love to be the driving energy of every action. To reject this plan is to violate the nature of things. To throw off its requirements is to buck the universe.

A deacon in a church said to me, "I believe in looking out for number one." That is the sure road to death. I believe he was dead when he said it. Some Christians are headed for the rocks because they violate the supreme message of Jesus. Wherein is the conduct of many Christians superior to that of the average non-church man? How many disciples of Jesus refuse to accept the favors of our system when such favors necessitate the oppression of their fellow-men? How many Christians refrain from using a pull when it can be secured, though every pull has somewhere its backkick? By how many is our system of favoritism in business and politics rejected in the name of Jesus? Do not many ministers in our churches

seek some other way than service to positions of influence and power? Any practice of selfishness, any reception of privileges or favors or pulls, when our advantage spells disadvantage for others, places the recipients on the road to death. We murder our own best future when we forsake the way of service and love.

When taking another way than the way of Jesus, we destroy our influence and power. The life of many Christians is without influence in the great issues of our time because the vital principles and forces which direct the evolution of society are forgotten. Many disciples of Jesus are living pagan lives. Their ideals, their purposes, and their passions are foreign to his great heart. They probably met the Christ in some great experience of years gone by, but today they do not know him. Wherefore, their lives are sinking in the quicksands of materialism and dying with the poison of selfishness. Materialism and selfishness cancel the power of all their victims.

The nations that reject the law of life are traveling the way of death. What have the attitudes and practices of the Western Christian nations toward the dark and tinted races of the earth to do with the message and Spirit of Jesus? Who dictates policies in the United States, when a cultured negro is led to live in another land, that he may be treated with justice and equality? What has the Spirit of Christ to do with a land that refuses a brown skin man a room in a hotel, or reluctantly consents to

give him one, providing he will leave before dawn? We are foreigners to the mind of Christ.

What has our nationalism to do with the message of Jesus? What does the spending of five billion dollars a year on war have to do with him? What shall we do with the fact that the largest armies and navies, and the most deadly weapons of destruction are in the control of those nations numbering the largest percentage Christian? We pray to the God of Jesus to help us murder our brothers! Voltaire said: "The blame for wars is to be placed upon those sedentary and slothful barbarians who from their palaces, give orders for murdering a million men and then solemnly thank God for their success." Has Jesus ever sat in the council rooms of the Christian nations? The world totters, and will go over the precipice, if it does not follow the law of love in international relations. The Christian nations must fall if they do not obey the message of their Lord.

Nineveh said, "I am; and there is none besides me." And the remains of Nineveh are mounds for the spade of the archæologist. The inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty, reads:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore—
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me—
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

We know the way to life, but knowledge is not love. Immortality awaits any nation that will follow the message of Jesus.

We are made to wonder if the organization which exists for the sole purpose of establishing the universal practice of this law, is itself obeying it. The church limps and lingers in a rigorous age, because it has forgotten its one message. Instead of becoming the servant of all, many of our churches seek to become the greatest in the midst. Imbibing the nationalism of their environment, they struggle for seats and locations of power. Many churches use the tactics of a sodden materialism to prove and hold their place with the great. Like the political world, and like the business world, they become apostles of favoritism. They live by the tithe of injustice and oppression. Wherefore, in the eyes of the masses, the church is infamous. In the eyes of many thinkers, she may be ignored. In the ongoing life of an evolving world, she counts for a fraction of what her genius allows. The church limps and lingers because she selects her emphasis from the margin of the message of her Lord. The center of that message says, "He that saveth his life shall lose it; but he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." When the church seeks to dodge this law of life, it dies. Abraham Lincoln said when he found a church that would practice this great law of love for God and man, "that church will I join with all my heart and all my soul." Multitudes more will do the same. The church dies of neglect because it will not follow the supreme law of life. Stanley Jones in "The Christ of the Indian Road," says, "It is evident that we must take our Christianity much more seriously,

or the non-Christian world will not take it at all."* The Christian church must follow her own message or pass out of existence.

Selfishness destroys its every adherent. Wherever it is practiced it wrecks things. This is the reason our economic order totters. It must always totter when following this law of death.

In its primary motive, in its major drive, in its chief ideal, it is violating the supreme law of successful living. What has the passion for private profits to do with the message of Christ? Our economic policy says: Cash in at the peak of the market. His policy says: Share where the need is greatest. Our greed for gain can not go unchallenged. If it does, we practice Christian ceremonies in a pagan land. What is membership in a Christian church, tacked on to a life that is wild for gain, when that gain is created by the pain of millions of workmen who do not share in the profits of their labor? It is the direct contradiction of struggle for the welfare of others. Therefore, it results in death. It could be specifically shown that this is true. In his book, "Love the Law of Life," Kagawa asks what is the result of the labor of 770,000 who manufacture wine; and what is the total result of the employment of 1,000,000 men in the manufacture of cigarettes? The ultimate result of the liquor business is, profits for a few and debauchery and poverty for millions. The final outcome of the cigarette business, is the wasted time of the million who produce them, the poverty

* By permission of the Abingdon Press.

of those who buy them, the wrecked physique and stunted minds of the millions who use them, and the hardened souls of those who profit by the prostitution of their fellow-men. Kagawa says, "In order to drag men away from love and kick them into the grave capitalism forces such labor upon men. It is the hungry demon that devours loveless men." It devours both those who produce, and those who consume the product. Greed will go to cruel extremes to reach its goal. But it thereby travels the way of death, and drags men down the same road. Jesus cast the money-changers out of the temple. But there is a temple more sacred than Solomon's; and the money-changers—the profit-seekers—the devotees of the god of greed—have crept into the inner precincts of this holy shrine, and are destroying much of the beauty of this most sacred of all temples. The Son of man again is challenging their right to a place in the temple of human welfare.

What has luxury in the presence of need to do with love? The universe exists for the service of all men. God planned it so. But all men are not receiving its service. The marvelous possibilities for the human family remain unrealized because of greed. A few are hindering God from serving the race with his world. Economic policies which keep from men the facilities for abundant living are a limitation on the divine energy and purpose. We bind the eternal spirit with our unworkable economy! It is blasphemy against human nature. It is sin against the God who created the

universe for all men. It is the anti-Christ, for it is the antithesis of the spirit of Jesus. Our stratified society can not stand. Castes and classes violate the law of life; and therefore they lead to the sickness and death of their victims. Injustice and inequality must die; or those who practice them will. Our present order is scarcely ready to wrestle with this problem; but within the immediate future we must struggle through to the mind of Christ. As many years as we hesitate, the social life of the world will totter. Our society must line up with the message of Jesus or revert to barbarism.

A part of the message of Jesus is coöperation. It is undoubtedly the way to the largest and richest life for all. Yet business continues to follow the method of competition. It does not seek the finest life for all, and serious troubles result. Do not business men have enough difficulties with which to compete in serving the public in a large way without competing with one another? Does not the race have enough competition with the hardships of nature, the ravages of disease, the inertia of indolence and indifference, and the challenge of the unattained, without competing with its fellows in the struggle for life and progress? Business can not follow methods which hinder the progress and welfare of all men and hope to live.

Price wars, boycotts, lockouts, and all the battlefield methods of a competitive system are the ways of death. They are the fever resulting from an internal enemy. The jealousy, hatred, and ill will of a class divided society are the rash and boils

of a blood poison resulting from luxury in the presence of need. Business depressions are the indigestion of a gluttonous greed. The ways of selfishness are the ways of death. Even business can not follow the law of death, and live. The ethics of Jesus have turned out to be "good sense and sound economics." They are the only economics that will work. The supreme challenge that faces our economic order is the call to give up greed and competition, and courageously follow the way of service and coöperation. Selfishness must be dethroned and love enthroned.

The battle of the centuries is the battle between selfishness and love. As Ross said, "The most stupendous enterprise of all time is the campaign against the unsocial self." Drummond stated it as follows: "From self-ism to other-ism is the supreme transition of history." It is the transition that must take place in every life. It is the enterprise that must be enacted in every relationship. This is the law of life. It is the heart of the gospel. This is the message of Jesus to our tottering world.

By this message our world shall live or die. By it every phase and department of the life of society will grow into the strength and power that must endure, or will go down into the defeat and destruction which are the fruits of selfishness. The message of Jesus is the message of life and death for our depressed world. Those who honestly and courageously interpret that message have some fundamental things to say about the solution of our economic problems. Those who dodge his mes-

sage, or do not know it, offer salve and soothing syrup. The soothing syrup just now is the advice to give to charity as being the best insurance against revolution.

It is suggested that the church should keep quiet on economic questions because she has nothing to contribute. As I have studied the actions of the many church conferences during the past two years, it appears that they are the ones who are speaking wisdom on the problems. Someone says, "Today it is the idealist who appears to have spoken wisdom; not the hard headed practical man who thought only in terms of 'bread,' but the far-seeing prophetic man who thought in terms of justice and fair play, friendliness, and good-will."

This is the supreme issue of our modern world. The race problem is shaking the foundation of society. I know the war problem is called the greatest problem of our century. There are other tremendous issues. But right at the heart of every one of them is the problem with which we wrestle. Basil Matthews says, "We are moving toward the hour when we shall see only Christ and Mammon erect, facing each other on earth."* Paul Hutchinson says: "If the organized religion of modern life is to mean anything to masses of our fellows, it must walk straight into the jaws of this insensible, remorseless, ceaselessly grinding industrial ma-

* From "The Clash of World Forces."

chine, out of which our greed extracts its profits, and wrest from it the majesty and supreme worth of the common man." *

How could anyone suggest that the church keep quiet on the question? Christians themselves do the suggesting. What formalism! What failure to comprehend the religion of Jesus! Keep quiet on the supreme problem of our age? Remain mum on the issue that touches all men every day of their lives? Say nothing about the dangers and difficulties that threaten civilization, and the very existence of the Christian church? Never! We must engage in the battle of the centuries.

The Christian church may yet redeem her influence and power, if she will promptly and courageously tackle every problem of her day and of her world. We linger behind our Lord! Halford E. Luccock says: "To conceive of the gospel as concerned merely with individual salvation is to withdraw religion from the most significant areas of life, and threaten not only the influence, but the very existence of Christianity itself. Such a separation will soon make of the church a little company of people on a side street, away from the main stream of life, singing ditties about heaven." † Of all days, this is the day for the church to speak her message. It is the day because all men everywhere are keenly realizing the need of something fundamental. It is the day because this is the genius

* From "World Revolution and Religion." Copyright, 1932. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

† From "Jesus and the American Mind." Copyright, 1930. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

of the message we speak. The unfettered follower of the Nazarene has a most fundamental and vital message for the economic world. It is the message of life. We must speak it.

The church herself is not following the law of life, if she does not speak the message of service, coöperation, and sacrifice, as the only way of life for the industrial order. She is not obeying the message she speaks if she is not willing to give it where it is most needed, even though the giving be at the cost of her own life. If she hesitates to speak the message of life, even though she be crucified by the world to which she speaks it, she is obeying the law of death. She herself will die with the world she refuses to save.

The church must give her message to save her own life. She must speak her message, if she would save the tottering economic order, which will continue to totter as long as it pursues the way of selfishness. She must proclaim the law of love to individual men as being the only power that can displace the spirit of greed and selfishness. The supreme responsibility of the church of Christ is to let men know the inevitable results of their ways.

The church dares leave no uncertainty in the minds of men that as long as business continues to take the way of selfishness, so long will the ups and downs of inflation and depression be in our course. The church must eternally testify to the certain failure of competition, greed, and the motive of private profits. She must, in no uncertain

terms, challenge the short-sighted selfishness which hangs on with a death grip to the ways of death. It is her task to make it known that all who hang on to the ways of selfishness ride on to destruction. Our present competitive system offers man the comforts of this world; but in its matured stage, it can not fulfill the promise.

If society rejects the mutualism of the way of Jesus, and holds on to the law of the jungle, giving the bloodstained products of economic warfare to those who are able to take them, then she shall have more of the jungle than its methods. The jungle waits on any civilization that rejects the way of Jesus. Unless our economic order can give up its greed for gain, its method of monopoly, its passion for power, its will to control the life and future of others, it is doubtful if it can endure. Unless the race can give up its selfishness the cycle theory of history will hold, and man will enter once again into the desert.

On the other hand, if the race will hear the message of Jesus, if it will take the way of service, coöperation, and struggle for the life of others, if it will obey the law of love in every relationship, it shall not only endure, its golden age shall be here, its Utopia shall be realized, the kingdom of God shall have come. When any nation is ready to practice the mutualism of Jesus, it shall develop into the finest civilization the world has ever known. It shall live in the realization of the best in every relationship. It shall have tasted the fruit of love. When we choose to obey the law of life

our tottering world will cease to totter and will begin to live in the joy and vigor of eternal youth.

HC106.3 S56
Revolution in economic life.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00059 5522